

for political reasons in order that we may appoint our friends to these positions," one would have understood that. But that is not what was done; the basis was antagonism to the members of the present Canadian wheat board, not to a member but to the members.

Where was the antagonism? Was it in the United States, which paid duty on 19,500,000 bushels, or among those who bought 5,000,000 bushels that had not gone into commercial channels but was still afloat? Was it in Europe? If so, by whom? It is an elementary rule that when a charge is made against a man who holds office under the crown he has a right to be heard in his defence; he has a right to know the charges levelled against him. There is a decision in the privy council in a case that went from Australia. There is the case of a judge who was dismissed from his high office because he had declined to deal with cases against himself where he had given promissory notes he would not pay, and notwithstanding his bad conduct the privy council decided that he had a right to be heard.

In the present instance, on whose part was there antagonism? In a later letter Mr. McFarland refers to the fact that but one name was given to him by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he deals with that phase of the matter. Now, I ask, can we hope to have any sort of public service in this country where men are to be thus pilloried without having an opportunity to be heard, and when they are heard and put up their case, containing as it does a complete refutation of the facts as stated, they are just simply told to get out? The order continues:

The minister is of opinion that it is inimical to the best interests of Canada in the circumstances that the present members of the Canadian Wheat Board should continue in office and, therefore, recommends that the said members, namely, John Irwin McFarland, Esquire, Chief Commissioner, David Livingston Smith, Esquire, Assistant Chief Commissioner, and Henry Clark Grant, Esquire, member of the board, be retired, the said retirements to take effect on the 3rd day of December, 1935.

The minister further recommends that the following persons be appointed members of the Canadian Wheat Board in place of those retired, namely, James R. Murray, Esquire, George McIvor, Esquire, and Alexander Malcolm Shaw, Esquire, and that James R. Murray be appointed Chief Commissioner, and George McIvor be appointed Assistant Chief Commissioner of the said board, the appointments aforesaid to take effect as of the said 3rd day of December, 1935.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendations and submit the same for approval.

It must be within the mind and knowledge of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) at least, the law officer advising the crown, that the wheat act provided, at the instance, to a very substantial extent, of members of this government, that the existing channels were to be utilized for the sale of wheat. They were to sell the wheat; and they were doing it. The wheat board had no agencies doing that at the moment, beyond the general way in which they were continuing to offer wheat for sale. These men were carrying on their business through the channels provided by statute, an act placed on the statute books last session, at the instance of, and if that expression is too strong, then with the approval and consent of the gentlemen who now occupy the treasury benches. How then could these men be guilty of sales resistance, when the business was being carried on through the constituted channels of trade, the men in the business, the elevator companies, the brokers, the great grain dealers? They were the people who, by statute, mark you, had to have an opportunity to sell the wheat of the country, and they were doing it; and notwithstanding that, in order to accomplish their purpose, hon. gentlemen make this statement against these three men, who could no more be responsible for sales resistance than a page in the house, seeing that the sales were carried on through channels provided by statute.

What follows: There is a communication in which these gentlemen present before the government the facts with respect to sales, telling them what the sales have been and what has been done. And then, when they find that they are about to be removed from office, they send the following telegram to the government, to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Euler) on the 2nd December, the day before they are removed from office:

Since receipt your telegrams of Nov. 29th by Smith and Grant we have jointly considered your letter of same date to McFarland. We deny that a sales resistance ever existed or now exists in world markets based on antagonism to the present board. We are of opinion that there is no evidence upon which the government could come to the opinion expressed in your letter and telegrams and that in fact all available statistical evidence is definitely to the contrary. If your request for our resignations were based on the desire of the government to have a board of members appointed by it and if the government will agree to pay to each of us in lieu of salary which otherwise we should have earned a sum to be agreed upon we are prepared on that basis and when such agreement is arrived at to tender our resignations but only if the statement in the second paragraph of your letter which in our view contains a serious reflection on the ability and integrity of all of us is withdrawn.

McFarland Smith Grant.