

than dividing our efforts in dealing with a common problem of vital concern.

In relation to wheat disposal, which is the subject of this bill, I should like to conclude the thought which I have been trying to express by suggesting that the Government of Canada might well endeavour to interest the Government at Washington in bringing about a joint North American wheat pool which would undertake to sell the surplus grain production of this continent to the best advantage of both countries.

In making that suggestion, I do so in the hope that I may have an opportunity later of developing more in the way of background and practical considerations bearing upon it. It is not a new idea in any sense. To my way of thinking, in the conditions that are tending to drive countries and areas of this world into a state of economic isolationism, not dissimilar from the conditions that obtained in the thirties and prior to the outbreak of war, it would be well for those who are in charge of the affairs of this country now to consider the most logical area in the western hemisphere for Canada to explore possibilities of dealing effectively with her economic and financial problems. With that suggestion I beg to conclude what I have to say in the debate on this bill, and to reassure my honourable friend the Leader of the Government that there is no partisan opposition to the principle of this bill, as far as I am concerned.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. J. Wesley Stambaugh: Honourable senators, the senator who has just taken his seat seems to think that one should have 40,000 or 50,000 bushels of grain storage to qualify him to speak on this bill. If that is a necessary qualification, I must say I do not qualify, for I have no wheat in storage, although I am a *bona fide* western farmer. The principal reason why I have no wheat in storage is that I have been for some time raising oats, barley and flax, and I have had little difficulty disposing of these grains. But I am very much interested in the people who, like myself, are raising oats and barley. I might say that in my own case I do not expect to have to use the act this year. I think I will be able to finance my farming without coming under the act—for one reason because half of my crop is snowed under and I won't have to dispose of it anyway.

But I would like to direct my remarks to the honourable member from Rosetown (Hon. Mr. Aseltine) of whom I asked a question last night and received an answer which I find, on reading it in *Hansard*, is a little different from what I thought it was last night.

I wonder if I might just read an extract from my honourable friend's explanation. I quote from yesterday's *Hansard*, page 96, second column:

In the case of oats the producer gets for 100 specified acres a cash advance of 20 cents a bushel on 1,500 bushels, which gives him \$300, . . .

I mentioned last night that I could not see anything in the bill that would give the producer of oats, any more than the producer of wheat, the right to sell more than six bushels to the acre. I brought that question up and I understand the honourable member to say that an amendment would be introduced that would cover that.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Stambaugh: I read in *Hansard* that you said an amendment could be introduced. I understood you to say "would", which is quite different. That is the reason I am on my feet again today, because there is nothing in the bill that would warrant me to think that a producer of oats could sell 15 bushels to the specified acre. Where do you get your information? Those on the Government side of the house must have some information that we on this side do not have. If it is the case that a producer of oats can get \$300 on 100 specified acres, the same as a producer of wheat, on six bushels to the acre, and the producer of barley can get the same amount, I have no objection.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: That is the intention.

Hon. Mr. Stambaugh: Well, I cannot see that in the terms of the bill before us.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: That is your argument.

Hon. Mr. Stambaugh: Can you see it in the bill?

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Don't ask me. I will answer it when I come to it.

Hon. Mr. Stambaugh: I would like to have it on the record that you can see it in the bill, or that you give an undertaking that it is the intention to introduce an amendment to provide that a producer of oats and a producer of barley will be on the same basis as a producer of wheat and able to get the same amount of loan for 100 acres that a producer of wheat can.

Hon. Thomas Reid: Honourable senators, I have just a word or two to say, as a purchaser of wheat and not as a seller of it.

First of all, however, I would like to make one or two comments regarding the statement made by the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Haig), when he challenged us to vote against the measures and go to the country. Everyone realizes of course that the Government is just waiting