

Canada Grain Act

1953-54 season, and made out to myself, membership No. 290-539. The total excess charges refund payable to me because of the quantity of grain I was able to deliver to my own elevator amounted to \$137.99. On that same basis, any statement that no one is going to be injured if the problem exists is not too accurate, because in the economic condition of western Canada today the sum of \$137.99 is very significant indeed.

It is on that basis that the farmers of Saskatchewan are fighting to have this principle restored by an amendment to the Canada Grain Act to give the farmers the right to deliver grain to the elevator of their choice. This is a principle that has been debated now for the third time. It has received the same lack of consideration by the government, but on previous occasions the government members were so little concerned about the problem that they did not mind voting against it. On this occasion they realize that the problem is perhaps serious, and rather than come out in a bold manner and vote against the principle of giving farmers the right to deliver to elevators of their choice, they give it the six months' hoist so as to avoid the possibility of having to express their attitude on that problem.

Mr. Tucker: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this is the second time the member speaking has wrongly described the amendment I moved. The amendment I moved is not the six months' hoist at all, and I would suggest that he should not misrepresent to the house the effect of the amendment I moved.

Mr. Johnson (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I misinterpreted what the hon. member for Rosthern said. I had anticipated as he started to speak, when he said he was not going to speak for very long, that he must have an amendment to move. That is why I assumed he would be moving the six months' hoist, rather than referring to the report of the standing committee on agriculture.

An hon. Member: You should have changed your script.

Mr. Johnson (Kindersley): Again on behalf of the farmers of western Canada, I am making an appeal to this house, to the members who are not acquainted with agricultural problems, to those members who did not sit in on too many meetings of the committee on agriculture and colonization but found it desirable to sit in on the final meeting when the decision was made. I am appealing to those members to consider the fairness of the proposition introduced in Bill No. 22. I am asking them to vote against

this principle of ignoring the privilege of the farmers to deliver grain to the elevators of their choice, and take the advice of this man whose letter I am going to read. It is addressed to the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce at Ottawa:

Dear Sir:

May I take this opportunity of acquainting you with my views regarding the present system of distributing box cars for the movement of grain as practised by the railways.

I should like first, however, to express my appreciation of the work and policy of the Canadian wheat board in the marketing of wheat and coarse grains since its inception. If it would complete the process by the inclusion of flax and rye, I am sure the change would be welcomed by the great majority of western farmers.

Returning to the matter of box cars, as you are aware, the majority of western farmers many years ago collectively established their own elevator facilities, the reason being that gross injustices were imposed by the private grain companies. Now we find that for the past several years we have been denied the privilege of using our own facilities to a large extent by the arbitrary policy of the railways in distributing cars, one to each elevator, regardless of the wishes of the farmers concerned. May I emphasize the fact that, generally speaking, pool elevators would be able to handle pool members' grain providing they were given an equitable share of box cars according to the wishes of all people delivering grain.

May I further suggest that the farmers have been very patient in this matter so far, depending on negotiation by our wheat pool officials with your government to obtain certain simple amendments to the Canada Grain Act which would guarantee to all farmers the right to deliver their grain to the elevator of their choice, whether it be pool or otherwise, without interfering with the provisions of the car order book, which, however, is not generally usable at the present time owing to quota restrictions, etc. I am afraid, however, at the rate tension is growing that serious repercussions are bound to come if this situation is not rectified in the near future.

May I conclude, Mr. Howe, by trusting that something consummate may be done regarding this urgent matter during the present session of parliament.

(Sgd) T. W. McTaggart.

That, Mr. Speaker, would summarize the views of the great majority of the farmers in western Canada. The time to take action to remedy this gross injustice is now.

Mr. Speaker: So that not too many hon. members will read documents commenting upon the legislation which is before the house, I should like to refer hon. members to citation 265, which is as follows:

It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the house and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the house.

Mr. H. R. Argue (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, the thing that has been moved by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) is a trick motion.