

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

from Canada to the United States, would eliminate most of our difficulties and would go a long way to solving any international wheat problem with surplus wheat.

I ask, what has been done to remove the embargo?

Then he dealt with the British market and he said:

Canadian farmers, therefore, are still vitally concerned with world markets and are fearful lest monetary difficulties and other trade obstructions deny them entry to their natural market which is the market of Great Britain.

I ask him to tell the house what he meant at Brantford and what he meant on other occasions when he talked of obstruction in high places, or were they merely statements in a long series of statements in which at one time he said that there is not a surplus and the next day said that there is a surplus? Indeed when he spoke to the United Nations food and agricultural organization in Washington he pointed out that Canada was in grave danger from surpluses, and I should like to refer to what he said:

The report further points out that we may be threatened in the near future by "surpluses"—however artificial they may be from a world standpoint—in such commodities as bread grains, coarse grains, rice, sugar, fats and oils and fish. We have already been threatened in Canada by surpluses of most of the foods referred to, the exceptions being rice and sugar.

I ask the minister: what did he mean when he delivered that speech at Brantford in the fall of 1949? Who are the people in Great Britain who are interfering with our trade which, as the minister said in Washington, is so important? Surely the minister said either too little or too much. Indeed the *Winnipeg Free Press* of December 9, 1949, said:

According to the Canadian Press, Mr. Gardiner did not enlarge upon the source or the extent of the "official effort" and until evidence is forthcoming the existence of such a "drive" should be discounted.

Mr. Gardiner: You will notice it is "official effort", not "officials' effort".

Mr. Diefenbaker: Official effort. Let the minister tell the House of Commons exactly what official effort in Great Britain is denying to Canada her natural markets. Surely among the members of one's own family there should be the fullest degree of trade which, as the minister pointed out in his address in Washington, is the natural trade. Surely frankness should characterize every relationship between the governments of the commonwealth. Yesterday the minister talked about the absence of surpluses. Here is something interesting. On February 13, 1950, he said, when speaking at the opening session of the Canadian horticultural council:

Some people in the world are making it difficult for Canada to distribute food surpluses to areas

[**Mr. Diefenbaker.**]

where they are needed. Conditions are not yet normal and Canada is producing surplus foodstuffs which are needed somewhere.

That was on February 13. He was speaking to farmers who know what the situation is. If he had told them there were no surpluses they would have said, "No surpluses? Well, what is wrong?" Therefore when he spoke to them he said there were surpluses. Then in the *Globe and Mail* of October 1, 1949, there is a report of a statement as to markets made by the minister. On that date he was interviewed about Canada's foodstuff markets in the United Kingdom and he said this:

We are trying to maintain Canada's markets in Britain, but there is no certainty that we can do so.

Then, mark these words:

However, Canada was not being "hurt by anything that has happened in Britain up to date. We haven't lost any markets if we haven't got anything to put into them."

In one speech in January he said that there were surpluses and in another in October, after the harvest was over, he was advising that there were not any surpluses. I suggest that we find out once and for all which statement is correct. Is there a surplus or is there not? In view of his diversified statements the Minister of Agriculture finds himself on the horns of a dilemma.

Mr. Gardiner: Read the whole speech. They are all the same.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All right.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You know, Mr. Speaker, when I get reactions like that it indicates I am saying something that is not altogether agreeable.

Mr. Gardiner: It is not agreed with by anybody who was at the meeting.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not through reading yet. I cannot begin to cover all the diversified fiction that I have before me.

Mr. Gardiner: If you would finish reading, it would answer your own idea.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am sure I have never seen my hon. friend so agitated before. I sit and listen to him as he fires brimstone on us but he cannot take it himself.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He says to producers that there are surpluses because he cannot tell them that there are not, and to others, in order to show why the situation is what it is, why trade is being lost and where our markets abroad have gone, that we have not any surpluses to sell anyway. To one he says we have plenty and to the other he says we have nothing. In a well-known song