

Turning to the importing nations, let us suppose that some nations have agreed to take a certain amount of wheat, but later discover that they do not need it, or have not the necessary American dollars to buy it. What will happen in that case? Can we make them take it? How can we? The only way would be to go to war. Under this agreement the importing countries cannot be forced to accept the grain, so of what use is it?

The respective parliaments of the countries who signed this agreement must approve it by July 1, 1948. But here a new difficulty arises: the United States Congress has adjourned until December. I admit that its members could be called back by the president; but do you suppose that, in the light of the political turmoil which will prevail in Philadelphia for the next couple of weeks, they would return to Washington to discuss this wheat agreement?

Further, do you think the American farmers will submit to an upset price of \$2 per bushel and to a minimum price of \$1.10? They will not. The United States government, not the farmers, will bear the loss. Our government has imposed a control; it does not propose to do that. In the last three years the Canadian government has taken not less than \$300 million from its farmers.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: More than that.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Yes, but to be on the safe side I say not less than \$300 million. This money has been given to the people of Canada. The farmers are now giving us our bread flour at \$1.55 a bushel; but for many years after controls were established the farmers supplied it at 77½ cents.

As I see it, honourable senators, the only good thing about this agreement is that it will never be carried out. I cannot see why a country which has to import wheat should be compelled to purchase that at \$2 a bushel or at \$1.50. How are these prices established? Why should the price be \$2 or \$1.10? I should like to ask the honourable senator from Thunder Bay (Hon. Mr. Paterson) how those figures were arrived at. They were reached by taking the price on the competitive world markets: on the Winnipeg, Chicago, Kansas and other grain exchanges. This is the very thing to which the men who drafted this agreement were opposed.

I am not blaming the government for this agreement. The heads of the wheat pools in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta were responsible for it. They forced it through, and we are absolutely playing into their hands. It is a mistake to think that nations will sell their wheat below its value, or that

other nations will buy it above its value when they can get cheaper wheat elsewhere. Take any of the thirty-three countries named on the list. If Afghanistan, for instance, could buy wheat under this agreement for \$1.50 a bushel, but Russia offered to furnish it at \$1 a bushel, Afghanistan might possibly be so concerned about the covenant it had made that it would pay the \$1.50. But is that likely when the wheat could be purchased from Russia at \$1 a bushel? I can think of many countries which would buy it at \$1 a bushel. What would Austria do, with the armies of Russia at her back door? She might say: "We can buy wheat from Russia for \$1 a bushel, but we have to pay \$1.40 to Canada or the United States". Then Russia could say: "Why buy wheat at \$1.40 a bushel from that great octopus, the United States, when we can sell you wheat right at your own back door for \$1 a bushel?" It is beyond my comprehension how we, as sensible men and women, can expect people to carry out such an agreement.

My honourable friend opposite, in the course of his remarks, referred to a certain well-known economist. The gentleman referred to is W. Sandford Evans of Winnipeg, one of the most competent grain authorities in the world today. He pointed out that if a country refused to import or export as it had agreed to do, it would take fifty-four days to get the machinery in motion to try to compel it to do so. What would happen in the meantime? Right now we are having trouble over our wheat contract with Great Britain.

There is great agitation over this wheat business. I have figures which show that up to the 16th of June this year our shipments of wheat are about 83 million bushels below what they were at this time a year ago. An honourable senator whom I will not identify, but who sits not far from me, has a large quantity of grain in a granary. So have many other farmers all over the West. Why do they not send it forward? I do not know, although I have an idea. The honourable senator from Lunenburg (Hon. Mr. Duff) is an expert on fish, but I am sure that if he were in the market for grain and had an offer from the Argentine at \$1 a bushel, he would not buy from the United States at \$1.40.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: You are right.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: That is only human nature. If a certain article were for sale on Sparks street at \$1, I would not go somewhere else and pay \$1.40.

In the International Wheat Council the three selling countries have a thousand votes, and the thirty-three buying countries also