

and the seller finds himself in a difficult position, because he is afraid that if he does not sell he will lose his market.

Hon. A. L. BEAUBIEN: I do not like to interrupt my honourable friend, but he knows, and so do I—

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Ask your question; do not make a speech.

Hon. A. L. BEAUBIEN: —that all the farmers' organizations were in favour of this contract. It was supported by the pools and by the Federation of Agriculture. When, under such conditions, a contract has been made for so many years with Great Britain, would my friend be in favour of breaking it now?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: My honourable friend has asked two questions in one. Let me answer his first question first. The wheat pools do not represent all the farmers of Western Canada—not by a long shot. I doubt whether the majority of farmers belong to these organizations. The honourable senator from Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar) may be better informed on that matter than I am. The organizers of the pools control these people, and the members fall into line. They were carried away with the idea that by this means they would establish for themselves a permanent market; but I believe that those who looked into the records of such transactions were opposed to the agreement. Of course, had members of the grain exchange opened their mouths about it, they would have been told "This is the grain exchange. Don't listen to them." Yet when the Hon. Mr. Justice Turgeon, of Saskatchewan, investigated the exchange he did not find them guilty.

The other question of the honourable senator from St. Jean Baptiste (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) was, whether I would cancel the agreement were I now in office. I spoke about that a year ago; it is a hard question to answer; but I do not believe that when Canada's name is affixed to a contract we should cancel that contract. I have always felt that contracts made on behalf of our country should be carried out.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Would the honourable senator suggest that Britain might break her part of the bargain?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I do not suggest that she may. All I am suggesting is that when the four-year term runs out Britain will buy in the cheapest market she can find. That we have sold her for \$1.55 wheat worth \$3.35 will not influence her one iota. However, if

I were a member of the government I would not vote to cancel that contract; once made, I would carry it out.

Hon. Mr. QUINN: But you would not have made it in the first place.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: No. I admit that. Take the Geneva agreements: they can be cancelled at the end of three years, and if after three years I did not think they were to the advantage of Canada, I would cancel them. But it would not be a good thing for Canada if, when the government changed, our contracts were repudiated.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: What about subsidizing the farmer to make good his losses?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: My honourable friend asks me what about subsidizing the farmer for his losses? It ought to be done. For the \$123 million which the government has lost, an estimate should be put through to recompense farmers who have shipped grain to the government.

There is one more point that I should like to touch upon before concluding. On October 22 of this year the government removed the ceiling price from oats and barley. Although criticism might have been offered for ceiling prices having been placed on these grains, nobody could have criticized the government had they removed the ceiling prices on August 1 instead of on October 22. The only excuse that I have heard offered for taking action on October 22 was that a meat packers' strike had been in progress and the government wanted it to be ended before dealing with the question. If that is an excuse, it is a very poor one.

What happened was that a large number of western Canadian farmers had sold the saleable part of their oats and barley—I would say seventy-five to eighty per cent—by that date. I do not know who owns the grain, but I am inclined to think that the speculators and merchants of this country have the largest part of it. I say that the government should not have removed the controls when they did unless they were prepared to recompense every farmer who sold his oats and barley between August 1 and October 22. As a matter of fact, that is what ought to be done right now. By their action the government showed an absolute disregard for the rights of the farmers of this country, not only those of the prairie provinces but farmers all over Canada. Every part of our country suffered by that action. If the government intended taking the ceiling off this grain they should have announced the fact last June or July, and everyone would have been ready for it. But that is not what was done: the government waited until the