

Freight assistance on western feed grains, \$16,500,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): An instance which was drawn to my attention not long ago I should like to bring before the committee, because it may be typical rather than an individual case in connection with this assistance given on feed grains. It is a situation which I think is unfair. A farm was owned by a widow who moved into Calgary. She rented her farm to a man in that neighbourhood, who farmed it for one year and raised coarse grains while he was renting it. Then he moved off and a new renter came on this year. Being a young fellow he bought stock and was going to feed hogs and cattle. He bought the grain which the farmer who had previously rented the place had raised. Then, when he applied for his fifteen and ten cents a bushel on the grain for feed purposes he was refused it. The government claimed that the subsidy could not be paid because the coarse grains had been raised on the same land where the stock was to be fed. The thing seemed so obviously wrong to me that I immediately wrote to the man and told him that I was sure there must be some mistake. As I began to go into it a little farther, I was informed unofficially that probably the reason for refusing the subsidy was that the permit had to stay with the land regardless of who the farmer might be. It seems to me that when there is an entirely different man renting the farm, the permit should not be attached to the land but rather to the man who raised the crop, and that the man who rented the farm should be entitled to his fifteen cents a bushel on the grain for feed purposes. I wish the minister would clear that up.

Mr. GARDINER: I assume that the only reason that could be given is the one just stated. If the permit was associated with the land and remained there, then the regulation, as I understand it, provides that anyone who has a permit to sell wheat or feed grain this year cannot himself become a purchaser of the grain and get the assistance that is paid on the grain that is purchased to feed.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): The man who had the permit and sold the grain was not the feeder. It was an entirely different renter.

Mr. GARDINER: It comes under the wheat board, under the Department of Trade and Commerce. But I have had correspondence with regard to other cases which involved the matter of requirements with respect to the permit book. I cannot see any other

[Mr. Gardiner.]

reason. I do not know why the permit book would follow the land. I think it is a case that requires some discussion with the wheat board, and if there has been a wrong interpretation by someone, I am sure that it would be straightened out.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): While it is not in the minister's department, I think it would assist the committee if the minister could state that the permit went with the man who raised the crop and did not stay with the land. There is the difficulty.

Mr. GARDINER: I am not in a position to state that, because I imagine it would depend somewhat on what the deal was as to whether the permit would or would not remain with the land. But if a person is buying grain from another person who previously owned it, and he had no interest in it, I would think that under the regulations if he drew that grain into the elevator and weighed it and then drew it out again, he would be able to draw the ten and fifteen cents. But it may be that he took the grain out of the bin and fed it to the hogs and cattle. If he did that, he would not be able to draw the ten and fifteen cents. He must take it into the elevator, weigh it and get a certificate, and move it out again.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): It has to be taken into the elevator and taken out again?

Mr. GARDINER: That is as I understand the regulations.

Mr. WRIGHT: Before the dinner recess I was mentioning the difficulties in the distribution of feed grains in the east. I would ask the minister to give us some account of what is being done and to tell us whether there are cases where the grain is being handled by several different firms before it gets to the consumer in eastern Canada, and, if so, what is being done to prevent that. It seems to be an unnecessary expense. There is also the question of grain which has to be shipped by water and goes into the terminal elevators in the east, on which transportation the freight rate is approximately \$4 a ton, while the rate on grain brought by rail is \$4.50. I should also like a break-down of this item by provinces. How much assistance has been given to feeders in Ontario, Quebec and the maritimes?

Mr. GARDINER: The amount of money paid out in freight assistance from October, 1941, to March 31, 1944, by provinces is as follows: