

consideration. However, so far as I am concerned this discussion left much to be desired. Quite a number of points that were raised were not cleared up to my satisfaction nor, I am sure, to that of many other honourable senators. I was glad to know that it is the intention of the honourable senator who introduced the bill to recommend that it be sent to committee. That course, in my opinion, is the right one, and no doubt in that way we shall get a lot of information which we desire to have, and possibly we may be able to improve the bill. When this "Act to provide for advance payment for prairie grain prior to delivery thereof" was introduced, it was hailed as a means of solving a great problem with which this country is faced. We were given to understand that at last a solution had been found to a great question which has occupied Parliament for many years, and that now we could turn our attention to something else. But it is evident, honourable senators, that the problem of the sale and disposal of wheat remains as insoluble as ever. It is with us today, and will remain, though this bill is passed, as acute as it has been over the years.

I think honourable senators will agree with me that there is only one solution, and that is to sell the wheat. We have to dispose of it. There are those who say we should curtail wheat production, but I do not line up with them. In the United States they had what they called a soil bank, but from what I understand that scheme did not work satisfactorily. I think it would be very difficult to say to western Canadian farmers that they are not to grow wheat on their wonderful wheat-producing lands. To my way of thinking the solution is to dispose of the wheat.

We have been doing fairly well in selling wheat over the years. It is true we have not sold as much as we have produced; but we have sold a considerable amount. The honourable senator from Rosetown when speaking last night gave the impression that we had not been able to sell our wheat. He was talking about the production of wheat, and he is reported at the bottom of the first column of page 95 of *Hansard* as saying:

As a result of the congestion the producers have not been able to sell their grain

Well, is that so? Then he went on to say: and so have not been able to get the necessary funds to carry on.

The fact is that every year millions of bushels of wheat have been sold. The honourable gentleman from Rosetown even said

so himself. I quote from his remarks in the second column of page 95:

The present situation as to wheat is something like this. There are 400 million bushels in country and terminal elevators and in transit, and there are 300 million bushels in storage on farms. The 1957 wheat crop amounts to approximately 350 million bushels.

That makes 1,050 million bushels. Then in the next paragraph he said:

It is estimated that 150 million bushels of wheat will be used in Canada

And of course it will be sold in Canada. and that 300 million bushels will be exported.

And of course that wheat too will be sold if it is exported. This means that during the coming year the estimated sale of Canadian wheat will amount to 450 million bushels. Therefore it is not correct to say that as a result of what has taken place the western farmers have not been able to sell their grain and so have not been able to get the necessary funds to carry on.

It is true they have not been able to sell their grain as soon as it is harvested, but over the years a huge quantity has been sold. Many hundreds of millions of dollars have come into Canada from the sale of Canadian wheat, and of course this money has gone to the farmers who produced the grain. That is as it should be. But I mention this to point out that we have not been entirely without the revenue which comes from the sale of three or four hundred million bushels of wheat every year.

Honourable senators, when the present administration came into power we all had great expectations as to what would occur as a result of the new trade policy. We looked forward to great things, and we thought that Canada's trade would be greater than it ever had been in the past. But what happened? We are more confused about this trade problem today than we have ever been before. We cannot see the daylight. I hope it is there, and that the problem will be solved. We find, however, that shortly after the new Government came into power the Prime Minister went to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meeting in London, England, and made a proposal that 15 per cent of our purchases from the United States should be diverted to the United Kingdom. We did not take any objection to that proposal, if it can be done, nor do I think the people of Canada took any objection, but that statement was scarcely in the press when shortly afterward another minister went to the United States and boldly and courageously told the Americans that we did not like the way they were doing business, especially their give-away policy with respect to wheat. Shortly after that there was a meeting at Mont