

*Canada Grain Act*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member should not say that any amendment which it is within the right of an hon. member to move in this house is a trick motion. I would ask him to withdraw that expression.

**Mr. Argue:** Mr. Speaker, then it is an undisguised device to take out of the report of the agriculture committee—that is exactly what it is—

**Mr. Speaker:** The procedure when the Speaker asks a member to withdraw is that he must first say, "I withdraw". Then he may modify it in acceptable form.

**Mr. Argue:** I am very sorry that I omitted to say I withdraw that expression. I have substituted the words "undisguised device". It is a strange device, taking a paragraph from an unmoved report of the agriculture committee and moving that paragraph as a method to kill a bill before this house. I say it would have been much better if the chairman of the agriculture committee had decided to move the report of the agriculture committee and the government members had allowed this house to make a decision on the principle of this bill by taking a vote on it on second reading. Whether or not there may be some merit in the words of the amendment, I think any member of this house is justified in voting against it because of the way it has been introduced. I want to say, though, that the amendment, as distinguished from the principle of the bill, does not solve the problem at all. I do not know of any farm organization which believes that the method whereby the wheat board handle shipping orders, as recommended in this resolution, is preferable to that of giving the farmer or the producer the right to deliver grain to the elevator of his own choice.

The truth is that the agriculture committee discussed this question and that, because of the attitude taken by government members, the problem is not being solved. Even if the recommendation of the committee is carried out, the producer is still denied the right to deliver grain to the elevator of his own choice. This device of making the wheat board undertake a function which the Minister of Trade and Commerce and hon. members opposite time and time again have said should not be made its function—namely the allocation of box cars—will not solve the problem but rather will add considerably to the difficulties and the work of the Canadian wheat board. In no way will it allow farmers to deliver grain to the elevator of their own choice. Even though the government members support this amendment and kill the bill

[Mr. Argue.]

in the expectation that it may get them off the hook, the fundamental issue still remains and still must be solved.

Over the last few years we have had on this issue of box car distribution one excuse after another advanced by the government. We have had promises that something was going to be done, but nothing has come of them. Before the agriculture committee last year the Minister of Trade and Commerce suggested, one time after another, that a car cycle was going to be established and that with this car cycle—a cycle of five years or ten years—box cars would be distributed amongst elevator companies. Nothing came of that suggestion. Nothing was done. The car cycle as represented to the agriculture committee last year by the minister remains an unfulfilled promise.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke at the convention of the Saskatchewan wheat pool last November. According to the statement made to the committee by the president of the pool, Mr. J. H. Wesson, it was not the officials of the wheat pool but rather the rank and file delegates who took the minister to task and asked him to do something to solve this problem. What was the answer? The answer was, "Go and talk to the railway companies; maybe they will do something. Take it to the presidents of the railway companies." The wheat pool officials went to the presidents of the railway companies. They said, "No, we will do nothing". Hence this second suggestion made by the minister amounted to nothing.

Then the wheat pool officials complained that the railway companies were spotting box cars not on the basis of the potential business of the elevator companies but merely on the basis of one box car for one elevator; but the Minister of Trade and Commerce often said in this house that such was not the case. We had some rather interesting information given to the committee by the wheat pool on that point and we had read into the record a sentence from a letter written last fall by the secretary of the board of grain commissioners, saying that in his opinion the railway companies had no alternative but to spot one box car for each elevator at a marketing point so long as the car order book was not in effect. But as we have seen—

**Mr. Tucker:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is misrepresenting the effect of that letter. The effect of the letter was that they had no authorization to do that. Let the hon. member read the letter. He has misrepresented the contents of it altogether.

**Mr. Argue:** That is not a point of order.

**Mr. Tucker:** It certainly is.