

passed a resolution demanding the Israelis to withdraw from the Gaza Strip unless many individual members of the U.N. intended to protect Israel's position afterwards.

Hon. Mr. Farris: Have they said they would?

Hon. Mr. Turgeon: I know what is in the mind of the honourable senator from Vancouver South (Hon. Mr. Farris), but I submit that Israel should withdraw from the Gaza Strip now, and it would then be the responsibility of the United Nations to back her up. This course would also enhance Mr. Pearson's efforts to establish the United Nations on a proper basis. If Israel were to decide to withdraw from the area concerned and rely upon the United Nations to carry out that which naturally is the conception of this resolution, then Mr. Pearson, who without question is the biggest man in the world today, so far as the United Nations force is concerned, would then be in a much stronger position to deal with Egypt, Russia, or any other country that is part of the United Nations.

That is one reason why I am supporting the vote. I sincerely hope that before very long Israel will take that attitude, because there is no other way to meet the situation. As it is, the United Nations has to pay the cost of getting traffic through the canal, largely on account of Nasser's attitude, and at the same time must take a certain definite action on behalf of the world at large. The proposed action by Israel would be the best way to relieve the situation, and would put the United Nations in a position where positive and effective action could be taken.

Honourable senators, I hope this vote will pass, and that our representative at the United Nations in New York, the Honourable Mr. Pearson, will be given added strength to deal with the matter.

Hon. Austin C. Taylor: Honourable senators, it was not my intention to speak on this subject, but since the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) and also the honourable member for Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar) made certain remarks which are not quite according to fact, I feel that I must reply.

Probably I am more familiar with the background of freight assistance than any other member of this house, because back in 1926, when I was President of the New Brunswick Farmers' and Dairymen's Association, I appeared before the Board of Railway Commissioners—now the Board of Transport Commissioners—and appealed for relief in relation to freight on feed grains to eastern Canada. I recall very distinctly at that time—and the record will bear this state-

ment out—that feeds could be shipped from western Canada to Halifax loaded on board vessels, shipped to Germany, unloaded and shipped back to Halifax for less money than it cost to buy and ship grain from western Canada to the eastern provinces. It was on that basis that I made the presentation to the board on behalf of the farmers of New Brunswick, and presentations continued to be made until 1941, when the present policy was adopted by the federal Government. The approach was made on the basis that some assistance must be given to the eastern farmer in relation to the feeds required in the east, because we could not grow them in sufficient quantities. From the time I became Minister of Agriculture, in 1935, on many occasions I attended conferences at which ministers and federal department officials met to discuss these matters, and at first the proposal was opposed by the western provinces, or at least by some of them. However, after three or four years of negotiation in an attempt by all parties to understand the problems of both east and west, an agreement was finally reached by the eastern farmers and organized agriculture in western Canada, that some assistance should be given to the eastern feeder because he was becoming, and now is, one of the best markets for the western grain farmer in the world today. It is true that the amount proposed is a considerable sum, but the western farmers are now shipping to the eastern provinces, under this freight assistance policy, from 2½ to 3½ million tons of feed per year, and that is why they support it.

I wish to point out to honourable senators that we in the east have always paid a certain portion of the cost of freight. I think the honourable senator from Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar) indicated that the freight assistance applied only from the head of the lakes to the east. That is quite true, but the federal Government has never paid the total cost of freight from the head of the lakes to the Maritimes or to any other part of eastern Canada. I happen to have the figures. From 1941 to 1956 the farmers of the Maritimes paid 25 cents freight on every bag of feed shipped. Since July 3, 1956 there have been two increases in freight rates; those have not been paid by the federal Government, but are being absorbed by the feeders of eastern Canada. In the Moncton area, instead of paying 25 cents we are now paying 34 cents; in Newfoundland they are paying 41.4 cents, and in or near Halifax, something like 38 cents is paid.

Honourable senators, I suggest that we not only support this policy but that we ask the federal Government to include the increase in freight rates over the basic rates