

40 cents a bushel." Within the next ten days four or five other farmers came in and said to me, "We can get that money for you, Haig, but we shall have to sell our oats and barley." I said, "Wait until the first of November." Now they think either that I am a genius or that I am in the confidence of the government and must have known that ceilings were to come off. If anybody other than the minister knew it, presumably this man did; at any rate he sold 3,000 bushels of oats and barley and received \$900 more than he would have got otherwise; and that happened to be the amount he owed my client.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: You did know, then?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: No, but he knew; that is, he was confident that it would happen.

Hon. Mr. COPP: He was just a gambler.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: If all restrictions were removed from the grain market, prices would rise at least 70 cents a bushel. That is the situation, and that explains the crisis. It is also a compelling reason why men and women in this chamber should forget politics and impress upon the government of this country that controls should be taken off and that our primary producers, whether of grain or any other commodity, should be free to sell their products on the world markets at world prices. If we are to guarantee the farmer \$1.55 a bushel for wheat, the manufacturers of Ontario, of Quebec, of the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia will be the first to complain. "Why," they will ask, "should we pay the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta \$1.55 if the world price of wheat is 90 cents?" If you give a guarantee to one interest you will have to concede it to every other form of production. The truth is that we are going the wrong way about it. Mr. Gardiner gambled with 600 million bushels of the producers' wheat, and he lost the gamble. In the sixteen months which ended last November we lost in this way \$335 million, the value of a whole year's crop in our western country. Why did the minister do this? Apparently he was advised by the pool men of Saskatchewan, in particular—perhaps also by the Manitoba pool, although I do not know—that it would be his political salvation. These men were determined that the grain exchange should be put out of business, and to accomplish this purpose they would sacrifice the whole grain trade of Western Canada. If an instrument intended for one purpose is used to achieve another, disaster always results.

In Manitoba this year our crop, with the exception of flax and rye, was poor. The same condition prevailed in Saskatchewan and, to a lesser extent, in Alberta. In face of these

facts we find the Parliamentary Secretary going to Middlesex and telling the farmers: "Hold your cattle, hold your hogs; better days are coming." Why should we in a free country follow a policy of that kind? It might be expected in Britain, under a sort of C.C.F. government, or in Russia under a dictatorship, but it is out of place here. Had the people of Canada voted in favour of government control of everything, although I would have opposed it, I would have nothing further to say. If our people had decided that the farmers should receive only a certain price for grain or cattle or hogs, although I would not have voted for it, I would have acquiesced. But the people of Canada did no such thing. And now we are paying the price of the government's policy.

Hon. A. L. BEAUBIEN: May I ask my honourable friend if the organizations which are supposed to be representative of the farmers did not consent to this wheat agreement? Were they not in favour of it? Surely we have to listen to the views of the representatives of organized farmers.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: One of the best farm papers, which used to be called the *Grain Growers' Guide*,—I do not know the present name of it—

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: *The Country Guide*.

Hon. Mr. HAIG:—recently took a census on this matter, and it reported that 55 per cent of the farmers of western Canada were opposed to all this grain control.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: That may be so, but the point is, what were their views at the time it was made?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Unfortunately it was represented to the farmers that if this deal were made the price of grain for years to come would be stabilized, and the market overseas would be maintained when the war was over. I am not an Englishman, and I do not pretend to know the sentiments of an Englishman, but I never heard of one allowing sympathy to stand in his way when he was making a bargain about anything he had to buy. You can bet that he made the best deal he possibly could under the circumstances. The fact that we are selling to the Britisher for \$1.55 wheat that is worth \$3.35 will be no help to us in four or five years when he comes to negotiate another agreement and offers, perhaps, \$1.55. As this writer says, when two governments are dickering with one another, the government which is seeking to buy grain says, in effect: "Unless you accept my price I shall buy from somebody else",