

are given a set price for wheat on the basis of delivery at Fort William, which means less freight rate at the farm, should first of all have taken the trouble to inquire into the situation with respect to their own farmers.

We have been told that we cannot get along without the Winnipeg grain exchange. I submit that we could get along very well without it because we have one of the greatest groups of parasites in Canada connected with that organization, and now that we are starting to unload, we might as well unload there as well as in some other places nearer home.

Coarse grains during the last number of years have been very low in price. They have been in the same position as wheat. We find that we are losing money on the coarse grains we grow. The market for coarse grains seems to have disappeared almost entirely. The fact that the farmers have been compelled to give up horses and produce with tractors at a lower cost is another reason for the reduction in the coarse grains market.

What is going to happen to the hog market? We may have an opportunity to discuss this a little later, but the way the hog market has been going for some time and the prospects as they appear to-day do not guarantee anything very hopeful in that line.

I believe that the wheat board act as it was passed in 1935 should be put into full effect and, as I have suggested time after time, the grain exchange closed and put out of business.

Some may argue that we are not entitled to the just price, or the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. To those who argue along that line I would say, are the firms which are manufacturing war goods entitled to a cost-plus price? If they are—and I am not complaining about it provided the profits are not excessive—then the farmers, who after all are the back-bone of Canada, should receive similar treatment.

I do not intend to say much more, but I should like to make a suggestion to the *Winnipeg Free Press*. That newspaper, I believe, is a supporter of the government which is now in office. On June 27 I with some other members had occasion to speak on the wheat question, and on July 3 or 4 the *Free Press* published an editorial in which it named two hon. members as well as myself. The other hon. members are well able to speak for themselves. I maintain that the *Free Press* misrepresented the remarks I made here. If they have somebody reporting for them here to-night, I would ask them to give the truth or keep quiet.

I hope that the government will not make any more mistakes in connection with the wheat board. I believe that the mistakes

[Mr. Fair.]

which they have already made in this connection have cost the farmers of Canada millions of dollars. Perhaps the profits went to privileged friends, but there are others who are entitled to a profit who will have to bear the brunt of taxation in this country, and who are deprived of the money which justly belongs to them.

Mr. LEADER: I certainly had not planned to say anything at the present time, but, listening to the debate as it progressed this afternoon and this evening, and representing a western constituency where the growing of wheat and other grains is veritably our bread and butter, I feel that my constituents would expect me to say something on a subject which affects them so vitally.

I want to pay my respects to our new Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon). I believe that his work has been commendable in some regards, if not in all. It is a sound policy to make provision under present conditions for more storage. Although I supported the 5,000 bushel limit last year, I agree that it has been a wise move to delete that provision as conditions are at present.

There is no question that we are in difficulties with regard to the marketing of our wheat, and it will need all the resourcefulness which our new minister possesses to get us out from under the burden which now afflicts us. Had I time, I might go back and give my impressions as to why we have been unable to sell our grain in foreign markets, but suffice it to say that one reason for our present difficulties in the marketing of grain and other products is the iniquitous tariff policies of not only this government but the one which preceded it. The old country has been Canada's best customer, and how had we treated her? It may be said that there is a British preference and that we allow many commodities to come into this country free of duty. But think of the manufactured goods which we might consume here, which are made—and well made—in the United Kingdom, but the importation of which is barred or hampered by the tariff walls that we have erected. It is all right to talk about patronizing home industry. We certainly owe the best that is in us to the people of this country. But there is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that we have protected manufacturers in Canada to the extent of sacrificing our basic industry, agriculture.

Last year, in a speech which I made in this house, I pointed out that we still maintain a tariff barrier of 30 per cent against many of the manufactured goods coming from the old