

grain people received in the neighbourhood of 13 or 14 cents a bushel on all the wheat they handled. I can give the committee those figures if necessary, because I know what they are.

Mr. Crerar: Does that include freight?

Mr. Donnelly: No, that does not include freight at all. That is something else which the farmer has to pay. This is just for elevation, storage, cleaning, loading into cars, service charges, diversion charges and matters of that kind.

That is, I think, proof enough for this committee that the grain trade have been well looked after by the government of the day. I well remember looking over the contract the grain trade received the year prior to this from the wheat committee. In that contract the trade was allowed storage from the time the wheat was dumped in the pit, irrespective of the fact that the farmer is entitled to two weeks' free storage, and usually for some thirteen days while it is in freight cars en route to terminals. Irrespective of these facts, that contract allowed the grain trade storage for those two weeks, and allowed storage while the grain was in freight cars in transit to terminals. That is something which I do not think can be justified under present conditions.

Mr. WOOD: With regard to the cost of storing wheat in elevators in western Canada, is it a fact that the major portion of the holdings is held by United Grain Growers and pool elevators? Is it not also a fact that the great majority of the stockholders of those two companies are farmers, and that the \$66,000,000 paid for storage, or a large portion of it, would go back to the farmers who are the shareholders in those companies?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Not to my knowledge. I have not the figures before me to answer that question properly. However, it is not so, to my knowledge.

Mr. WOOD: That is a pertinent question, when the hon. member is speaking about farmers' incomes.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): My time is almost up, and I should like to finish what I have to say.

Mr. WOOD: Perhaps the committee would give the hon. member extra time.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have not the figures before me. I will say, however, that I am opposed to the deal which has been given the grain trade, although I have not time to go into it in detail at the moment.

As I said earlier, I am firmly convinced that if we are to deliver this wheat on a quota basis, then we should be guaranteed somewhere near the parity price which, it has been admitted elsewhere by many people, is approximately \$1.25, basis Fort William. The

provincial governments, the municipal unions, the pools—all organizations on the prairies connected with the welfare of the farmer are practically in unison that the farmer should have what would be the equivalent of at least 95 cents a bushel. As I said, they asked that the initial payment be at least 85 cents a bushel, other amounts being taken into consideration to reimburse them as time went on.

I have said I am firmly convinced that what is needed more than anything else in Canada is a great national agricultural policy. We have anything but that at the present time. Throughout Canada we have a great economic disunity. I hate to think of what might happen in the country were it not for the fact that Canadians are determined to win this war, irrespective of whether or not they are given leadership. That is one factor which is saving the great economic difficulty in our midst at this particular time. There is no doubt in my mind as to that fact.

The Sirois commission report makes fine reference to agricultural conditions in Canada. I was very disappointed that more did not come out of that conference which was held on January 14 and 15. There has never been a greater lack of leadership displayed in the history of Canada than was displayed at that conference by the Prime Minister. Much good would have come out of that conference if the federal and provincial authorities had sat round this table and discussed the economic situation. I think we might, after further consideration, give an advanced price to the producers of this country on the quota which they will be forced to deliver this year.

Mr. ROWE: It is not my intention to keep the committee at any great length at this time; in fact, from the appearance of the committee it would appear that it is not its desire that I should. I wish, however, to conclude what I was saying the other evening. Since receiving the regulations which were brought down by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), I feel more alarmed than ever over this new fantastic type of policy which is being enunciated in this proposed vote. I realize, as does every hon. member, that for some years the wheat problem has been of grave concern to everyone interested in the welfare of this dominion. It has interested those of the banking profession; it has certainly interested those of the bond and mortgage houses, and it has interested those who are dependent upon the wheat fields. On the other hand, there are those in the country who believe that bonuses and subsidies are vicious in principle and should never be applied to agriculture.

I feel that we have long since adopted the principle of bonuses and subsidies in our