

Then a little farther down:—

“It is one thing to interfere with trade because of the exigencies and conditions resultant from war. It is another thing to have that control woven into the fabric of our laws as a permanent policy of the country. . . .”

Again, a little farther down:—

“Personally I am opposed entirely to any permanent policy that means the control of the marketing of grain in this country. I agree with my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). With him occasionally I have differed in the past; but I am at one with him in this respect, that this measure, if adopted as a permanent policy, will be a long step forward in the direction of the socialization of industry in this country. If my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior and other members of the Government contemplate embarking on the theories of Marxian socialism in this country, well and good; but any permanent control of wheat marketing in this country means that and nothing else, and for that reason I do not think it is wise as a permanent policy, either in the interests of the consumers or in the interests of the producers, and I desire to so state my position in that regard in relation to this Bill.”

Those of us who are in sympathy with the re-establishment of the Wheat Board want to know why it should be re-established for only one year, with the possibility of the de-control again taking place, which would create a disturbing condition at the beginning and also at the end of the control by a Wheat Board?

Mr. MAHARG: The resolutions that have been passed by the different organizations have not asked for the Board for just one year. They have asked for it for the season for 1922 and until such times as normal conditions assert themselves. I do not know how long it would be for; it might be for two years or longer, and it might be for only one year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Are conditions not approaching nearly normal now? Wheat is quoted at about \$1.35. I have seen wheat marketed at considerably under a dollar in normal conditions.

Mr. MAHARG: That is only one of the conditions. Conditions are very far from being normal all over the world. The buying of wheat in the Old Country is far from being normal. They are buying from hand to mouth in many countries and it may be necessary to hold wheat in order to stabilize the price to an extent that was unknown before. The conditions are not normal in so far as the individual producer is concerned. He is not his own master to the extent he used to be. He is controlled very largely by other interests than his own. There are scores of conditions which are not yet normal. The price of wheat has returned to normal, but it sometimes gets below normal. The question of wages was mentioned here as being largely responsible for abnormal conditions. So they are, but other factors enter into the question. The farmer is continually purchasing implements for use on his farm, and they are not always immediately paid for. He must incur that heavy overhead, and liabilities contracted when prices were high must be met even if everything came back to a normal condition. In many instances he was compelled to pay three times the prices that obtain under normal conditions.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Conditions were far from normal while the former Wheat Board was in operation owing to the fact that the British Government, which was the largest purchaser, and the allied Governments decided to purchase through a Commission. That de-control has taken place.

Mr. MAHARG: That is quite true. That condition of national and international buying has been removed, but the financial condition of the country is so abnormal that people just buy when they can buy, and there is not the steady flow there used to be.

The committee adjourned until Tuesday, April 11, at eleven o'clock, a.m.