

am glad that my hon. friend—I was going to say “the minister”, but he is not the minister yet—has information which some of us have not received.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): That would not be hard.

Mr. PERLEY: I protested against the deal which was made last fall by the board with the grain interests for the handling of the wheat. I protested against storage being paid on grain when it was in the elevators and while it was en route. I have here a copy of the agreement made with the elevator interests, and section 19 distinctly states that the board pay storage on class B wheat from the time it is delivered to the elevator and the daily report received in the head office in Winnipeg and for thirteen days after the date of the billing out of that wheat. I object to that because in my opinion it is not a fair charge and those people are not entitled to it.

I referred a moment ago to the question of a gift of wheat. I would endorse the action of the government if they would spend \$50,000,000 more in trying to make the farmer of western Canada more prosperous by investing the money in his wheat. I suppose that before parliament prorogues we shall vote the amount of the deficit of the Canadian National Railways. We have done it here for years. Almost in a minute, without giving it much consideration, \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 is voted for this purpose. Why not invest another \$50,000,000 for the benefit of the farmer?

Coarse grains should be brought under the provisions of the act. The hon. member for Weyburn dealt at length this afternoon with this matter and made out a good case for including coarse grains within the operations of the board.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): One of the reasons for the deficits of the Canadian National Railways is that wheat is carried so cheaply.

Mr. PERLEY: Well, if there had not been a wheat crop for them to carry they would have been pretty badly off, because most of what they do earn comes from the carriage of wheat from western Canada.

A noted parliamentarian once stated that an opposition should suggest nothing and oppose everything. That has not been my way of operating. I have offered from the floor of this house many constructive suggestions, and I am pleased to note that some of them at least, two in particular, have been adopted by the present minister and are embodied in the bill which will be founded on the resolution.

When the bill comes down we shall examine it carefully and inquire into a number of matters. I have suggested a reduction in freights and lake rates. We should be given some idea of how far it is intended to super-vise the grain exchange if it is to remain open.

I am not afraid of the future so far as a great carryover of wheat is concerned. I hold in my hand a crop report, which I received to-day, dated July 20 and compiled by a crop reporter who works for a Minneapolis firm and incidentally, I believe, sends reports to the James Richardson company. This report would indicate that there will be nowhere near 400,000,000 bushels of wheat in western Canada this fall. It states, as regards Saskatchewan in particular, that 12,000,000 acres are definitely below the average; 1,000,000 acres will possibly have an average crop, and 2,000,000 acres may yield five to seven bushels an acre. The reports I received are bad but Saskatchewan is a big province and western Canada is a big country. I do not believe that we shall have a 300,000,000 bushel crop, but I believe the situation can be met. I have also a report from the grain exchange on Friday last to the effect that on that date the Argentine sold 2,771,000 bushels of wheat to Britain at a price which, converted into Canadian money at the Canadian seaboard, would represent about 80 cents a bushel for our wheat. I am not saying that this report is true. It came from the grain exchange on Friday morning last. If it is true, however, I would ask this question: If the Argentine can do this, why cannot the Canadian government sell wheat to the British government in greater quantities than it is doing at the present time?

Mr. GARDINER: Is the usual premium included in making the estimate of the price at the seaboard?

Mr. PERLEY: It is calculated that the price at the seaboard here would be practically 80 cents. When the bill comes down we shall see exactly what its provisions are and we shall have some questions to ask. There is a good deal of information which I should like to get and I hope the minister will be prepared to give it. With regard to the operations of the board, just where they stand; what they have been paying in service fees, storage fees, brokerage fees; what they hold in cash; the matter of options, and so on, are all questions with respect to which we shall have to have a complete report similar to that which was given in 1936. However, we shall wait and see what the bill contains, and then we shall review it in the light of a careful study of its provisions.