

In the case of oats in the 1957-58 pool it amounted to 8 or 9 cents per bushel. It would be the same case in respect of barley. I can give you the actual figure on barley. I do not think barley was quite as high. We do not have the same carrying charges on barley. Quoting from our report:—

“The principal item in operating costs was carrying charges which amounted to \$4,862,703.43 or 4.177 cents per bushel on producers’ deliveries to the pool. Interest and bank charges amounted to \$12,048.46. Diversion charges on barley shipped to the Pacific coast for export amounted to \$145,983.90. At the same time freight recoveries on these west coast shipments amounted to \$697,299.28. Drying charges, and brokerage and clearing association charges were \$21,496.90 and \$12,874.69 respectively. Administrative and general expenses amounted to \$502,567.19 or .4317 cent per bushel on producers’ deliveries of 116,405,633.9 bushels.

Net operating cost applicable to the 1957-1958 barley pool were \$4,860,375.29.”

The total charges on barley were not as heavy as on oats due to the storage factor because we carried larger stocks of oats.

This trend has been reversed this year. The quantity of oats that has been delivered to the current pool, carried in commercial position, is much below what it was in this last pool.

Mr. ARGUE: The discussion we have been having centers around whether or not steps may be taken to weaken the control of the Canadian wheat board over the orderly marketing of grain as it applies to feed mills.

I would like to see the committee in discussing this question also consider—as I am sure we are doing—how the position of the board might be strengthened even beyond that which it is today, so that the board might be able to do a more effective job in the orderly marketing of grain.

I wonder if Mr. McNamara would care to tell the committee whether he feels that the powers of the board, after grave decision, are fully adequate, or if the board in its judgment feels that parliament should give to it additional powers, or whether there should be greater cooperation by the provinces.

I am very much in favour of the wheat board system of marketing grain, and I would like to see this authority maintained, and, if it is needed, extended. I wonder if the committee might have the views of the board on this particular question.

Mr. McNAMARA: That is a very difficult question to answer.

Mr. McINTOSH: Is this just in regard to feed mills, or does it have general application to board policy, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: It is in connection with feed mills, I presume.

Mr. ARGUE: This has to do with the quota system and the things we have been talking about, such as the delivery of grain to machinery dealers and so on.

Mr. McNAMARA: It is pretty hard to separate a particular question from a general question. The question is related to feed mills; but I would say that I think we have the legal authority under our act to enable us to enforce the quota regulations. But at the same time, as I indicated previously, I think we have to have producer support of this policy for us to do an effective job.

If you would not mind my drawing on an illustration, it becomes something like prohibition; if the public is not for it, then it is very difficult to enforce.

I have been concerned in recent months at the attitude of some producers who advocate quotas and indicate that they want us to administer them, yet some of them seem to be taking advantage of opportunities themselves.