

Tremblant, and we were all startled when a proposal was made that we should have complete free trade with the United Kingdom. That proposal did not come from our Government, but nevertheless it was made, and we were becoming perplexed. A short time later another minister, probably one who had been at those conferences, went to Washington, and again the Americans were boldly told that we did not like their way of doing business, especially their give-away policy in connection with wheat. Then there was a hurried trip by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to London. We thought something might come out of that. The minister returned and, despite our hopes, nothing has come out of it yet. Again, a minister went to New York with a hat in one hand and a club in the other, and he also told the American people that we do not like the way they are doing business, especially their give-away policy. That minister has scarcely returned home, when another minister is off to Geneva, and of course we hope something will come of this. And now what do we hear? Well, we hear that the ministers are going to China to sell goods to that country. Honourable senators, we trust these endeavours will produce the desired results, but I must say that none of us can see the daylight; it seems more like a Chinese puzzle to us than anything else. The problem is truly there.

Again, we were amazed just at the end of last week when we read that India was to get \$7 million worth of wheat under the Colombo Plan. Under that plan India or any other country does not pay dollars or sterling—in fact, does not pay anything—for what it gets. So what are we doing? I am in favour of the Colombo Plan, wholeheartedly in favour of it, but what are we doing? Are we now going to compete with the United States give-away policy in connection with wheat? Is that the proposal? We do not like it when the United States gives away wheat, and we have complained to them for doing so. Are we now saying that we, too, are going to give away wheat? If that is the policy of the Government I think we should know it. I repeat that I am strongly in favour of anything that we can do under the Colombo Plan. This year the former Government provided for an expenditure of \$34.4 million under the Colombo Plan. The present Government has increased that to \$35.4 million. How is that expenditure distributed? Honourable senators, as far as I can make out we have not given any wheat to India under that plan since 1953. We have been using that money for the payment of metals, for capital projects, and for sending people to India in order to give certain technical assistance. So the \$7 million which during the last few years

has been paid largely to Canadian industries for capital goods is now not going to be paid to them. I am not here to say that Canadian industries are more entitled to it than is the Wheat Board, but when we divert it from the industries to wheat it means that \$7 million less will be going into the industries of this country for wages and so forth. That is what the shift means. And I ask you, honourable senators, whether at this time, when the industrial picture and the employment situation is not too bright, is it advisable to make the shift now from industry to the Wheat Board. I say that is the only way in which this gift of \$7 million in wheat can be carried out.

Honourable senators, may I now turn to the bill itself? I was disturbed last night during the discussion on clause 10 of the bill relating to liens. Clause 10 reads:

Where the board has made an advance payment to a producer, the board has a lien for the amount thereof on the grain in respect of which the advance payment was made.

There is no information here as to whether this is a first lien or second lien, or whether it has priority over any other lien. Now, I understand—and if I am wrong some honourable senator from the west can correct me—that if a farmer neglects to pay his taxes the municipality has a lien on whatever he possesses for the payment of those taxes. If I am wrong I stand to be corrected, but if I am right I want to know which lien comes first, that of the Wheat Board or that of the township.

I understand provision is made under the Prairie Grain Producers Interim Financing Act that a bank can take a lien on the produce of a farmer; that I am told can be done under section 88 of the Bank Act. If that is so, which lien comes first, that of the township, that of the Wheat Board or that of the bank? This is a question which was not answered satisfactorily last evening; I hope that when the bill goes to committee the matter will be definitely settled, and that if necessary the bill will be amended.

One further matter was not, in my opinion, disposed of satisfactorily last evening: I refer to the affidavit which the farmer has to make before he gets his advance. Who draws the affidavit, and before whom is it sworn? Does the farmer have to go to a lawyer who prepares the affidavit for him and then acts as commissioner in the taking of the affidavit, for all of which the farmer has to pay the lawyer? I am not practising law in western Canada, so I cannot speak for myself. But does the farmer have to go to this trouble and expense?