

that they should see this position—may I say that at that time line elevators, so-called, were not the prevalent places to which people went to sell. In the towns there at that time there was a country elevator; there was one which was owned perhaps by a grist mill and one perhaps owned by somebody else, to provide some opposition in the purchase of wheat.

Then we went to another stage, and I say this, because I think one should present both sides of a problem. I make this statement which will completely satisfy my hon. friends to the left, the C.C.F., because they know my attitude with respect to private enterprise, individual enterprise, or whatever you care to call it. We then had an agitation among the farmers—that was in the twenties—that they should join together and do something. That was done. Why was it done? I say this to the grain trade. It was done because of unfair practices carried on by the line elevator companies, particularly in connection with what we called street prices. Street prices were the cash prices paid for wagon loads or anything less than a carload, as grain was delivered to those elevators.

I could mention another instance where there was an agitation which brought results in connection with farming. That was not so much in reference to prices, but in regard to the conditions under which farmers purchased their implements. I have been practising law since 1908. I remember one of the jobs I had with a very large law firm; I was ashamed of myself then and I am still ashamed. The contracts under which farm implements were sold at that time contained some very fine print, which at my present age I could not read even with the aid of the largest magnifying glass in the world; and I was engaged in taking back implements from farmers who did not pay, who were perhaps unable to pay, implements which, in the early days of the introduction of tractors, perhaps were not worth paying for anyway. So another agitation arose. The result was that in Saskatchewan you had and still have what they call a statutory contract, while in Alberta it resulted in the passing of the farm machinery act to remedy the evil.

The point I make is that in those days movements like those grew. In any big movement in Canada, be it in agriculture, labour or anywhere else, if we probe to the bottom, no matter what names we may call individuals we shall usually find a sound reason behind it. Again I credit my C.C.F. friends that, on the economic side of the picture, their movement was born in grief, trouble and distress; and it was born in the city in which I live. But

there is a great deal of difference between that time and the present. Then information passed from neighbour to neighbour in chats over backyard fences, or at casual meetings in towns where purchases were made. Then we had a pretty fair idea; in fact we were sure and even yet we can be sure, that the grievances were real. However, we all know that a grievance, sound though it may be, may reach a stature and complexity which causes it to lose its first purpose. In western Canada today we have three wheat pools which have plenty of radio time, which publish newspapers, and so on; so that I do not take statements made by officers of those organizations on the same basis as the movements which began years ago.

It may interest you, Mr. Speaker, as it certainly has interested me, to notice the parallel that exists between two movements which have grown up in this country. I refer to organization among the farmers and organization in labour. I am not critical of this; I think it is inevitable, but here is what we have now. In both farm and labour organizations we have had such a growth that at the top they are operated by professional advocates. I say I do not criticize that. I think it was perhaps inevitable, but I do say that if you go to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture with a problem you will get an answer back the next day. You can do the same with the C.I.O. or the A.F. of L.; but I for one do not accept these quick decisions as being the judgment of those whom these people head up and represent in these central organizations. So I say that with respect to barley and oats—and I am coming back to it, and this is all I am going to say now—there is no majority demand in western Canada for the passing of this legislation.

Mr. BURTON: Oh, oh.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I hear some groaning. I will give you a bit more.

Mr. BURTON: You are wrong.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I make that statement, and I shall prove it before I finish.

Mr. BURTON: Perhaps to your satisfaction, but not to mine.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Probably I could not prove anything to your satisfaction; you know I have my weaknesses as well as anyone else. Opinions in the west are not unanimous with respect to this matter. The Alberta pool at least are realistic about it; although they gave it formal endorsement, they are certainly well divided. Recently at