

*Supply—Trade and Commerce*

May. Perhaps his trade officials have led him down the garden path so far as the United States is concerned, and that country is taking over our markets. I should like to know what is going on behind the closed doors.

4. Has the United States subsidized its exports of grain so as to be able to supply Canada's best customers with wheat below the minimum price? How much has the United States dumped on the market?

I did not know what the minister was going to announce today but I should like to ask him another question. On the strength of Canada subsidizing its wheat for the first time, will the United States make other reprisals? Did the minister say to the minister of agriculture or minister of trade in the United States, or to any of his officials: We are going back to western Canada to bolster up our political chances by giving the farmers a bonus?

One of our great problems in the export market has always been the competition of the United States. That is why over the years governments have always considered the matter very carefully before subsidizing grain in this manner. It was always felt that if we were to subsidize grain in this manner the United States, with its power and economic might, would be able to dump its grain onto our markets.

I referred to 1929 and 1930 when young men and women were taken out of school and put off the farms with nothing but their possessions. We have just had the biggest drought in western Canada in 30 years, and the only reason we have had any kind of crop is the reserve moisture of former years. In Great Britain today there is a recession and there are economic difficulties in other countries. High interest rates prevail. The same circumstances existed prior to 1929 when the crash came on the farms. This crash will come again, in spite of the assurances of the minister, if we lose our markets.

What good is a bonus, Mr. Chairman, if we do not sell our wheat? How long will the taxpayers of Canada keep the government in office if no wheat is moving to Canadian markets? That is the question.

5. Is there no agreement operating at the present time to protect the western producers and to guarantee them any floor price, or do we merely accept the word of the United States that that country will maintain a moral obligation to Canada?

If there is such a moral obligation, what was the question asked by the minister when

he met Mr. Freeman on September 12? Did the minister ask Mr. Freeman why the United States was selling its wheat when it gave us its word that it would not sell it below the minimum price? Was this action taken so as to get our markets? I should like to know what was the answer. Was the government pussy-footing with the United States? Or did the minister stand up like the former leader of the opposition when he was prime minister and was told that the United States would not assist Canada to load grain destined for China and Russia? The right hon. gentleman told the President at that time that Canadian wheat would be loaded on the ships and would be exported, that this country was a sovereign state. I suggest that this is the kind of action that this government should be taking. Are we now an economic satellite of the United States in respect of wheat and other commodities?

I am not expert in industrial affairs, Mr. Chairman, but I suggest that members of parliament from areas of industry should take note of what happens to those industries when tariffs go by the board.

6. Is the position that the United States has taken since the Geneva conference against Canada's export of grain a reprisal against Canada for the exports to China and Russia? Has the minister discussed this?

7. What assurance has the minister received from Mr. Freeman in Washington to restore the buyers' confidence in the market and recover one cent or more?

Can the minister say whether since his chat the price has gone back 1½ cents or 2½ cents? The fact is that the price has gone down 22 cents. Is it bouncing back? Time will tell, but it is taking a long time.

8. Can the minister now guarantee to parliament that no further sales by the United States or any other country will be made below the minimum price?

Did the officials in the United States say to the minister that they were sorry they ruined our market in Japan and may ruin it in Great Britain, but that from now on they were going to be good boys because they had a moral arrangement with us? Did they take advantage of this vacuum to unload their surpluses? That is the question that the farmers in the farm organizations across the country are asking, and they are not going to be satisfied with the minister's announcement today that he is giving a bonus when our market prospects are deteriorating day by day and nothing is being done. If the minister had