

*The Address—Mr. Low*

until a point is reached as it now is where that international wheat agreement price becomes completely inadequate.

As I have said already in this session on another matter, I believe that in the government's wheat policy—as in other policies affecting agricultural products—the farmers should have a guaranteed floor based on a parity price. The wheat farmer in the United States is infinitely better off than the wheat farmer in Canada. The United States government signed the international wheat agreement and agreed to supply a greater quantity of wheat than that supplied by Canada. But the United States government has never forced United States farmers to take merely the international wheat agreement price for wheat with their increasing cost of production. The cost of producing wheat has risen in the United States, but the United States farmer is guaranteed 90 per cent of parity, which this year is \$2.17 a bushel.

In addition to that guarantee, the farmer in the United States receives any increase in the price finally obtained for wheat. He receives the highest prevailing price. The Chicago price recently has been approximately \$2.55 a bushel. The United States farmer receives the full price. For the hundreds of millions of bushels of United States wheat being sold under the international wheat agreement the United States farmers are not asked to make up the difference, as are the farmers in Canada, but rather the government of the United States pays the difference between the highest price and the international wheat agreement price. In Canada, however, our government refuses to pay anything more than the international wheat agreement price; and in addition, it forces Canadian wheat producers to subsidize the Canadian consumer, at the present time, to the extent of more than 50 cents a bushel. I say it is a gross injustice to force any group within Canada to subsidize everybody else in Canada; and I think the time has arrived when the government should give to the wheat producers of Canada the best possible price for wheat going into the production of Canadian flour and for use in Canada.

If the government does not want wheat sold to the Canadian millers at \$2.50 a bushel to result in an increase in the price of bread, then I suggest to the government that it provide a subsidy to the Canadian consumer in order that the price of bread will not be increased. But in the meantime it is certainly unjust and discriminatory for the government to force prairie wheat producers to subsidize everybody else in Canada, when the Canadian government and the Canadian public are

risking absolutely nothing in the way of placing a floor price under wheat. I think it is time the wheat producers of Canada received a guaranteed price for wheat year in and year out, at a price commensurate with the cost of production.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I impress upon the government the need to give more than mere consideration to all of the questions we have raised in regard to storage, the 75 per cent advance, increased box car facilities and so on. The time has arrived when the wheat producers in western Canada want action, not merely consideration.

**Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies whatever for taking part in this debate the second time. I say that because, since I first spoke on the C.C.F. amendment, a number of very important things have taken place in the house which require that I do say something this afternoon. I do not intend to take very long to do it, but I feel perfectly justified in speaking in support of the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) on behalf of the Social Credit group.

Before I launch into things which I want to say in connection with the amendment, and other things, Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment just briefly on some things that have been said here this afternoon by other hon. members. First, the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. McCusker), who placed before the house what I think is very useful information concerning civil defence. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for Regina City, that I look upon this whole matter of civil defence as of very great importance to this country, and I feel that too much information about it cannot possibly be given to the Canadian people. Therefore I welcome any information we can get here. I have been personally interested in the whole program for civil defence, and have stated on various occasions what my own views were. I do not want to go into them this afternoon, but I should like to point out to the hon. member for Regina City that in the program as it is now going forward something seems to be lacking.

I am told by various people that considerable complaint is being made about the training schemes that are being conducted in various centres throughout the country. The complaint is that trainees are taken into the centres; they are given a period of training in civil defence, and when they go back home to their own communities they have nothing to work with. Well, that is like what the United States government did a few