

and other commodities. In other words, we have lost probably \$200,000,000 on last year's crop with respect to the United Kingdom-Canada agreement, and this is over and above the approximately \$80,000,000 contribution in regard to the 70,000,000 bushels of wheat used for domestic consumption in Canada.

Mr. GARDINER: If I might ask a question, will the hon. member not agree that the same condition does not apply to wheat that applies to cattle? The Canadian government is responsible for the fact that cattle cannot be exported to the United States, but the United States government is responsible for the fact that, regardless of price, Canadian wheat cannot be exported to that country.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I have always understood that, and I have never requested that our wheat should be exported to the United States. We have exported wheat to some forty other nations, and I am not asking that wheat be shipped to the United States today. We could sell the 160,000,000 bushels we are exporting to the United Kingdom, together with the 70,000,000 bushels, to those forty countries to which we have exported wheat, at the price quoted by Mr. McIvor. That is the point. Certainly the beef and wheat deals are entirely different.

Then I want to say that the United Kingdom-Canada wheat agreement was the cause of the failure of the international wheat conference, which met in London for some weeks during March and April of this year and concluded without agreeing on a price policy. If there is any need to prove that statement I might quote, first, from the *Christian Science Monitor* of Boston dated April 24, 1947. It contains a lengthy article from which I should like to read only one or two paragraphs:

Argentina dissociated itself from price controls at an early stage of the proceedings.

Then the article goes on to give the reasons, and continues:

"Why should we pay £400 for a British motor car which was worth £200 pre-war," an Argentine spokesman said, "and still export our wheat at so little more than the pre-war price?"

Britain, on the other hand, is concerned with conserving its dollar currency. Britain's delegates were prepared to accept prices similar to those embodied in the Anglo-Canadian wheat agreement. These ranged from \$1.55 a bushel in 1947-48 to \$1.25 in 1948-49 and not less than \$1 in 1949-50.

The draft agreement laid down minimum and maximum prices of \$1.40 and \$1.80 for 1947-48; \$1.30 to \$1.70 for 1948-49; and \$1.20 and \$1.10 for 1949-50 and 1950-51, respectively.

If it accepted the agreement as it stood, Britain was, therefore, faced with being able to buy wheat imports at a lower price immediately

at the expense of binding itself to pay prices two or three years hence, which it considers will be well above current market prices.

Then an article in the *Financial Post* of April 26, 1947, is headed "World wheat pact dealt death blow by price dispute." If anyone still doubts my statement, I have the *Manitoba Co-operator* of May 1, 1947, which carries the same information. There is also another article in the *Financial Post* of May 10, headed:

Blow-up of wheat pact averts split in prices
Believe U.K. would have bought \$1.80

Figure for 1947-48—New multilateral agreement merely sets floor and ceiling levels.

All this is, I think, convincing proof of the truth of my statement.

I now wish to repeat what I have maintained in other sessions; that is, that full production is the true basis of real wealth. The productivity of essential goods is real wealth in this or any other nation, and we should never lose sight of that fact. The number of Canadian-born people leaving this country to take up residence in the United States is altogether too great; that statement is borne out by the Minister of Finance in his budget presentation. During the history of this country over 3,047,000 people went to the United States from Canada. The 1940 census showed the number of Canadians in the United States at that date to be 1,044,119. This situation is continuing chiefly because of the difference in the standards of living within the two countries, and because of the lack of economic opportunities on this side of the border. I am convinced that a nation like Canada cannot continue indefinitely and successfully alongside a nation like the United States, with this great economic disparity prevailing as it does today. With our great undeveloped natural resources and our wide open spaces we must build up an economy that will attract good citizens in great numbers, and at the same time provide the required opportunities for our native-born.

I wish to make reference to another matter, the Dominion Elections Act, to ask that provision be made for the transferable vote in dominion elections. In the election of 1940, some seventy-four members, including myself, were elected on a minority vote. In the election of 1945, I believe 150 members of the 245 were elected on a minority vote. During recent years, the multiplicity of parties in Canada has complicated the entire election machinery of the country. The transferable vote has been used satisfactorily for quite a number of years under the provincial election acts of Manitoba and Alberta. Surely members of this parliament should be elected by