

of anybody who knows anything about the situation, and that is the one providing that the payments shall be made on the 1945, 1946 and 1947 crops. The other part is controversial, and I suggest that the proper committee, the parliamentary committee on agriculture, should deal with that part of it. I suggest that if we can get this legislation or the part that is non-controversial before the house this evening, it will pass through committee rapidly and the bill can go through. The second part of the legislation with regard to coarse grains can be adopted in the committee. We can get it through, bring it in here again and, if possible, get it passed through this house. But at any rate we shall not be holding up the money that is due to these farmers—a payment of their own funds. This money belongs to them because it was made out of grain which they grew and delivered themselves in those years.

This whole matter of coarse grains is of vital importance to the growers of western Canada, to the feeders of eastern Canada, to the consumers generally, to the feed companies and to the Winnipeg grain exchange; and quite rightly so. The life of the Winnipeg grain exchange depends upon whether or not they are to be allowed to handle these coarse grains and the other grains. On the other hand, the welfare of the Canadian farmer depends upon whether there is to be orderly marketing of his grain and his crop in this country and whether we are to have the old grain exchange. The Canadian people can make their choice. If there is to be orderly marketing, there must be the power within the Canadian wheat board, which operates and handles their grains, to control that grain. We cannot have part of it rambling out through the grain exchange and gambling on it here and there, and part of it sold through the wheat board. We think it should be settled, by a voluntary decision of the representatives of the people in this house, as to which they are to have. If the government is to decide on a policy of orderly marketing, I think this legislation should go into effect. I know it will have the support of the growers, because the growers know that under the wheat board if there is anything coming out of the sale of their grain, it will be returned to them. It is not costing the taxpayers of Canada anything. Of course there will be a big fight; those who believe in private enterprise, that is the grain exchange, naturally will oppose this legislation. We believe that the grain exchange should be done away with; that a government agency should operate, at no expense to the country, because the operations of the wheat board are paid for from the profits of their own undertakings and every-

thing beyond the cost of handling goes back to the men who grew the grain. If anyone is entitled to profits, certainly it is those who grew the grain and not those people who gamble in the wheat pit and, as far as has been proved to date, perform no useful function or at least no function comparable with the amount of money they get out of it.

Personally I am doubtful whether the present government believes this legislation will go through. If the Liberal party had been sincere in its belief that the Winnipeg grain exchange should be done away with and that there should be orderly marketing of the farmers' produce through a government agency without profit, they could have enacted this legislation long ago. If the Tory party had believed in it they could have brought in legislation, while they were in power, which would have done away with the grain exchange. The truth of the matter is that both parties have been in power, but the grain exchange is still carrying on. The biggest blow it ever got was when all wheat had to be handled through the wheat board.

Mr. GARDINER: The Conservatives did bring in that legislation.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Yes, they brought in legislation but they did not implement it, and the grain exchange continued to operate. Last year, when we were considering amendments to the wheat board act, I moved an amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. McKay), which would have brought coarse grains under the wheat board. That amendment was declared unconstitutional. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) said it would endanger the wheat board itself. The chairman of the committee asked me to withdraw it, but we said we would fight for it because we believed that commodities of this kind should be handled by the wheat board, in order to prevent the very thing that happened last fall. That is, coarse grains remained under control; the price the farmer would get was fixed; he got his 1947 price and delivered his grain at that low price. Then on October 21 the lid was taken off; prices went up, and the feed and grain companies had picked up the coarse grains. Farmers were not allowed to deliver wheat; the elevators were instructed to get out all the coarse grains possible, that they were needed immediately, and I believe they were. But the farmer was obliged to sell at low prices. The minister claims they did so with their eyes open. They did not. They did not know what would happen. As a result, the grain companies made profits. I do not know what profits the feed companies made; I do not know how much grain they bought,