

the issue involved in the matter is simply this: We say that we do not trust the farmers of this country to sell their produce, and that the Government of Canada proposes to act as salesman for the primary producers. To any such proposal I take violent exception. I think the farmers of Canada are just as capable as any other people to market their production, and that their right of free-will should not be curtailed.

To illustrate my contention, I wish to read at some length from an editorial which appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press* on Wednesday, December 17. No newspaper in Canada has fought more bitterly against government control of the farmers' production than the *Free Press*, and none has challenged more persistently the wheat agreement and all it implies. In its latest editorial on this subject this newspaper confirms something I said about a year and a half ago in this chamber, namely that the father of the Wheat Control Bill is not the Minister of Agriculture—although he has to take responsibility for it—but Mr. J. H. Wesson, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. A reading of the agreement makes it quite plain that Mr. Wesson's whole object was to put the Winnipeg Grain Exchange out of business. He makes no bones about it. In putting the present policy into effect the Wheat Board, according to the government's own statement, lost last year \$123 million, and this year, on the basis of current prices, will lose another \$200 million. I point out that those figures are the government's own estimates. Today, or at any rate on December 6, when I left Winnipeg, one could not buy a bushel of wheat from the Wheat Board at Winnipeg to ship to China, or Australia, or France, or Italy, at less than \$3.35 f.o.b. Fort William.

Now let us see what the *Free Press* says. Politically it usually supports the government of the day, but it makes exceptions, and I do not blame it for the stand it is now taking, because there is no argument which can justify losses by the western farmers of over \$300 million in two years, and the truth is that no justification has ever been attempted.

Hon. A. L. BEAUBIEN: May I ask my honourable friend a question?

The Hon. the SPEAKER: I had occasion a year or so ago to rule that it is not in the interests of debate in this chamber that editorials should be read here and printed in full in *Hansard*. It is allowable for an honourable member to quote a section from an editorial as part of his argument so that he himself would in effect be making the statement, but he should not read editorials into *Hansard*. I

believe my ruling on that occasion was right, and I would call it to the attention of the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Your Honour, I will certainly accept your ruling. Incidentally it relieves me of a good deal of work. All I shall do is to read one brief section:

As stated here on a previous occasion, the most misleading statement in this extract from Mr. Wesson's speech is that the pool farmers "did not want to scrap the British Wheat agreement in favour of the open market . . ." Mr. Wesson must know that the alternative to the wheat agreement is not the open market. It can be a state monopoly, a compulsory wheat board, selling wheat at the world price. That is the policy that has been in operation in Australia for some years.

I shall not transgress the rules by reading the editorial at length, but I may state that the gist of its argument is that you do not need to re-establish the Winnipeg Grain Exchange in order to avoid selling to the wheat pool. Take away the compulsory pool: the alternative is an open market, where you can sell as you like. Some say that we would sell through the grain exchange. That is not necessarily so. People could sell to the elevator companies through their agents in our towns and villages. When I was a boy there were elevators, owned by farmers in the various localities all over Manitoba, which bought the wheat and sold it again. What every elevator company did was this—my honourable friend from Thunder Bay (Hon. Mr. Paterson) can correct me if I am wrong—when a man brought a load of grain to, say, Alexandria, the elevator man would grade it No. 2 Northern, at one or two or six pounds dockage for dirt, as the case may be. That grain—say it is a thousand bushels—would go into the elevator, and after the elevator man bought it outright he would wire immediately to his principals in Winnipeg that he had bought a thousand bushels of No. 2 Northern at Alexandria. The next morning the elevator company would sell the No. 2 Northern at the market price. It could not be run in any other way. In 1939 the wheat pools did try to run it differently, and the result was that the wheat pools lost in Manitoba nearly \$3 million, in Saskatchewan nearly \$8 million, and in Alberta \$6 million, and the governments of those provinces came forward and guaranteed the loss. I know that is what the Government of Manitoba did.

The same situation applies with respect to bacon. What right has the Dominion Government to take bacon away from the producers at a certain price and sell it on the British market at another price? The London