

Canadian Wheat Board Act

The third and fourth areas that we have to look at are the levy deductions, how they are going to be carried out. Knocking them off the pay-outs is one method which is suggested in here which may need to be looked at as well.

All in all, I have no particular concerns about the Bill. We will support it, but we do need to look at it and, possibly, there need to be some amendments. The people who have been non-participants in the past really need an opportunity to be able to say yes or no to some of the things that are in here, or give us advice as to how they think we should handle it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT**MEASURE TO AMEND**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-92, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There are three motions in the amendment of report stage of Bill C-92, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, and all are related to Clause 8 of the Bill. After consultation, I am selecting Motions Nos. 1 and 3. Both will be debated and voted on separately. Motion No. 2 will not be selected. It is in the name of the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) and is in essence identical to the motion which was moved, debated and negated in committee.

Therefore, the House will now proceed to debate on Motion No. 1.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma) moved:

That Bill C-92 be amended in Clause 8 by striking out line 33 at page 33 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"railway car during the pool period. The said sum shall reflect an equitable allocation of the costs incurred by the Board to maintain the country delivery points."

He said: Mr. Speaker, my motion which amends Clause 8 is a provision to ensure that the amount provided for in Section 8, which provides for the Government to prescribe a payment to those farmers who use producer cars, is paid. The question turns on how large that payment will be, and how much of the

cost maintaining the country elevator should be charged to those who use the country elevator system and those who use producer cars. My amendment provides that the said sum shall reflect an equitable allocation of the cost incurred by the Canadian Wheat Board to maintain the country delivery points.

• (1400)

There has been a great controversy surrounding this issue. The Prairie Pools has sent every Member of Parliament a letter which says:

Clause 8 would allow the Canadian Wheat Board to waive interest and storage charges on grain shipped in producer cars.

The farmers' right to use a producer car must be maintained. However, the only savings that should be deducted are elevation and handling costs.

The argument there is that the only cost that should be deducted and paid out as a sum to an individual farmer is the elevation and handling charges. This argument is put in very strong terms.

This letter received from the Prairie Pools today was signed by Mr. William Strath, Mr. Garth Stevenson and Mr. D. Livingstone, the Presidents of the three western pools. They go on to say:

Any further deduction of storage will likely add to the costs of those farmers using the country elevator system. The infrastructure costs of western Canada's grain handling system are not charged to the users of producer cars.

There is clear evidence of extra costs associated with the producer car since these costs are attributed to the railways and are paid for by all producers in the costing process.

You are aware of direct expressions of concern from large numbers of grain producers in the Prairie area. We urge you to take all possible steps to remove Clause 8 from Bill C-92.

The pools feel very strongly that this payment as proposed in Clause 8 would not necessarily ensure that those using producer cars are paying their fair share of maintaining the infrastructure surrounding the operation of the country delivery points. I do not want to elaborate any more fully. In committee, I thought that my motion was relatively mild. It did not propose to delete the clause.

The Canadian Wheat Board does not have the full responsibility for all of this. Some of it comes under the Western Grain Transportation Agency and some of it under the Wheat Board Act. We were not dealing with the Western Grain Transportation Act so we could not deal with that side of it. The Government refused to give us the cost figures. My amendment is simply designed to provide that there be a fair share of the costs of maintaining the country delivery point paid by those people using producer cars.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this motion moved by the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), particularly since I understand that my motion which is very similar was not allowed. I did not know the decision of the Chair until this moment.