

Supply—Agriculture

even possible under the previous administration. There are other ministries within this present government that might even profit from this experience.

The attitude of the Liberals in attacking the minister can be pretty well understood. I think they are logical. They undoubtedly hoped that it would have some strategic or tactical advantage. It was certainly opportunistic in purpose. I think some of them have been having second thoughts. It would not surprise me at all if the Leader of the Opposition regretted very much some of the remarks he made in his opening speech in this debate, particularly in view of the support the minister has garnered in the west and the editorial comment that has come out. The Leader of the Opposition said these suggestions were ridiculous. Then later he found that one of them was not so ridiculous. The Leader of the Opposition has managed to get one foot out of his mouth, and given time no doubt he will be able to extricate the other.

Mr. Argue: I wonder who wrote this speech.

Mr. Chaplin: I can say this to my hon. friend that I have not the facilities for anyone to write my speeches. I have not the money to have a Mr. Lamontagne on my staff.

Mr. Argue: I wonder if Roy Faibish happened to write it?

Mr. Chaplin: No, Roy Faibish did not write this.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the attitude as I see it of the New Democratic party is not as readily understandable as that of the Liberal party in this matter, because they are the ones who are continually talking about democratic planning. I heard the leader of that party the other day, in the course of a speech in this house, use the word "planning" in almost every sentence. He referred to economic planning and democratic planning and, as I understand it, those are the keys to their whole political philosophy. This has been the major slogan in their propaganda.

Here we have a practical application of democratic planning. Here we have a minister going to the people who are most concerned about this problem and making suggestions to them for their consideration. Here we have democratic planning in its essence, right from the grass roots. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam does not recognize this democratic planning when he sees it. He has been so blinded over the years by his preaching of the doctrine and dogma of socialism

that he does not recognize real democratic planning when it takes place before his eyes.

I believe the hon. member for Red Deer was quite right in his speech the other night. I think he got the gist of the whole thing when he said during the course of his speech that planning is good, but planning which reaches down from the top defeats the purpose of a democratic society. He said that planning which permits people collectively to work together and plan from the grass roots up is good. I gathered from his remarks that he probably had a better and sounder idea of democratic planning than have some of the mandarins of the New Democratic party.

The Leader of the Opposition in the course of his remarks in the house the other day referred at some length, and I think quite properly, to the changing patterns of trade that are taking place throughout the world, and to the fact that wheat sales are going to be more competitive. I am sure the minister has recognized this fact. It is the recognition of this fact that has led to these suggestions he made to the wheat pool members. A substantial portion of our wheat sales at the present time are going to communist China. I think the minister recognizes that this is a precarious market, and that we would be in a stronger position if we attempted to develop a dozen small markets rather than have too many eggs or rather in this case too much wheat in the red China basket. I feel this is one of the major reasons for the making of these suggestions which, if they were accepted, would strengthen our selling potential and would provide some protection against loss in the development of new markets.

It has recently been stated in the press at some length that China wanted to sell textiles and other manufactured articles to this country to pay for this wheat. When I say "sell" it virtually means the dumping of goods into this country because of the appallingly low wages paid in China. I have always felt that the sale of wheat to red China was a sound policy on the part of the government. I have also felt it was what might be described as windfall business. The Chinese have not bought from us because they like us or admire us. They would not buy from us if they were not forced to do so by conditions in their own country. China has got herself into a desperate plight. Here we have a country that has practised the ultimate in economic planning and has succeeded in bringing upon the unfortunate people of that nation the greatest man made famine in history.