

proper way or a proper person to deal with, and not the person now there? Is that not absurd?

Mr. DUNNING: It certainly is.

Mr. BENNETT: Let us go a step further. I am coming now to the four months before Mr. McFarland was dismissed. The smallest percentage of Canadian wheat imported in the ten year period I have mentioned was in 1929, and the largest percentage ever imported into England in that ten year period was in 1932. There you have it, the situation: The smallest in the ten year period was in 1929, and the largest in 1932. We now come to the four months ending November 30, 1935, when Mr. McFarland was chairman of the board, and Messrs. Smith and Grant were the remaining members. In that time what was our percentage of the wheat which went to Great Britain? It was 38½ per cent. But the average during the years the other gentlemen were running on a supply and demand basis, and the grain exchange was in control, was 32 per cent; yet it was 38½ per cent in the four months between August 1 and the time Mr. McFarland was dismissed. Is that sales resistance?

An hon. MEMBER: Sure.

Mr. BENNETT: An hon. member says, "sure." I thought so. That is sales resistance, is it?

I am coming now to another side of the matter, to a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture during a by-election as to the quantity of wheat taken over from the co-operative organization, and the amount of available wheat in the country. I am asking him where the short interest is. Who benefited by the action taken on the grain exchange when Argentine wheat went up twenty cents? Who had the short interest on that day? Who had the 30,000,000 bushels of wheat that are not in the country, and which were taken over by the wheat board from the cooperative organization? Who were they?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock I was pointing out that when the wheat board took over the available wheat held by the cooperative selling agency, according to the statement made in western Canada by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) they had to purchase [Mr. Bennett.]

298,000,000 bushels of wheat. When I say 298,000,000 bushels, I refer to the wheat and the contracts for wheat making up that total. The documents issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce presided over by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) indicate that at that time there were only 265,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat, including feed wheat, in commercial channels on this continent. I wonder if the minister was aware of that fact when he made that statement? Was he aware that the farmers then owned about 5,000,000 bushels of that wheat in public storage? Was he aware that the public, about which they speak so frequently as being buyers of wheat, were the owners of many millions of bushels of that 265,000,000 bushels which they had bought for future delivery? Yet in spite of all that we have 298,000,000 bushels of wheat and futures contracts taken over by the wheat board at an average price of about 85 cents. I think that was the blackboard price at that time. I ask this house and I ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Crerar), who more than anybody else is responsible for the present condition, whether or not an explanation can be given of what became of the difference between the 298,000,000 bushels of wheat and futures and the 265,000,000 bushels which was the total quantity on the American continent, and which, as I say, included 5,000,000 bushels in the hands of the farmers and many millions of bushels in the hands of the public.

Why? Of course there was a short interest. There were people who had sold wheat that they did not own upon the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. That is a matter known to everyone. And what happened to them? In December last the Argentine raised the price of wheat over night by 20 cents per bushel. What happened to your short friends then? Were they protected on the Winnipeg market? How were they protected? Did they suffer? Did they cover? What happened? In Chicago the maximum price was increased the full five cents allowed by the exchange. Three cents was the limit fixed in Winnipeg by the exchange as the amount prices could rise in a day. As a consequence of a rise at Buenos Aires of 20 cents per bushel for Argentine wheat, wheat in Winnipeg rose a maximum of three cents per bushel. That did not represent its value; that represented an arbitrary rule passed by the grain exchange as to the maximum it could rise. Under those circumstances the shorts were protected. That is the position.

I put this further statement to the house. I wonder if hon. members of this house recall