

respectfully—is not new. We can go back to another day when Pontius Pilate made a certain offer and the answer was, "Crucify him, crucify him", not because that was right, not for a moment, but because that was the way the crowd were thinking at that time. Some people—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman again but he has exhausted his time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Let him finish.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I shall conclude very quickly, Mr. Speaker. While it is important, with respect to barley and oats, to the western grower and the eastern and British Columbia buyer, this thing goes very much further. The constitutional aspect I leave alone. I was never much of a constitutional lawyer, although I have read with great care the last case, that is the marketing case, where it is all reviewed by the chief justice and confirmed by the privy council. But here is my original point, and all I am trying to say; I put this in the form of an appeal to all members of the House of Commons. I do not think I have been partisan, or very partisan, in anything I have said; but there are many, many of us here, who give lip service to our present form of economy. I go farther and say that I think those of us who have done so really believe in that form and that the lip service I have mentioned was honestly given in support of that method of carrying on our business.

But, sir, with this particular thing, with this thing for which there is no universal demand, with this thing which must inevitably end in disunity, are we to be driven, to be forced by the advocates, the professional advocates, of some farmer groups, into taking from our farmers the last vestige of permission to bargain for their own products?

I understand the position of the C.C.F. They are logical. That is their belief. The rest of us have said that is not our belief; and so, sir, I say to you that I think it is time that those of us who believe in this economy, this economy which has given us the best standard of living in the world, this economy which produced so much during the war and which helped to win the war, should stand up boldly and be counted.

I mention two persons who, I think, must vote against this resolution: the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilesley) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). May I read from page 868 of *Hansard* of Thursday, February

27, 1947. I do not think it is against the rules to read from last year's *Hansard*. I was speaking and I said:

There is another thing I wish to ask the government, and I think it has been fairly put to them by my hon. friends to my immediate left. I think the government should be as frank as I am. Do they favour the compulsory handling of coarse grain by a wheat board? I have heard the ministers talk all around or over the question.

Mr. Ilesley: I cannot speak on behalf of the government, but I will say that, personally, I am not.

Then I go on:

May I say that I heard the answer of the Minister of Justice with the greatest of delight. I was sure he would say that. Now that we are holding this evangelistic meeting, there are two more ministers for us to hear from.

Then the Minister of Agriculture spoke and he said:

Even in a revival meeting I do not usually go very far beyond the present time. I wish to say that I am opposed to putting the compulsory clause as related to coarse grains into this bill, which is what we are dealing with at the present time. I am opposed to that, and I think that is about as far as one needs to go at the moment.

What has happened since that date, February 27, 1947, to have the minister change his mind and make such a speech as he did in this House of Commons not so very long ago in support of this bill?

Mr. KNOWLES: Those who came to scoff, remained to pray.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Then I went on. My old friend, the then Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon), with his usual astuteness and that charming smile of his, disarmed me and I sat down without getting an answer from him. But knowing him as I do, and knowing the things he believes in, I am perfectly certain that if he votes in favour of this bill, he at least has the grace left to blush in so prostituting the principle which has made him the great man he is.

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): I am sure we all listened, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of pleasure to the last speaker. He certainly made his position quite plain. He was quite frank in his statements, and I respect him for that. He talked long about the support that should be given to private enterprise such as the Winnipeg grain exchange. He knows the history of it, and he knows of the money which the grain exchange made out of the western farmers. That is probably why private enterprise supports it. But I say that