

Then the government changed, and in 1930 the problem was shifted to the Bennett administration. I shall not go into details with respect to those five years further than to recite that as we all know, Mr. McFarland was placed in charge in 1931, and carried out his stabilization operations. I would say, however, that according to the Turgeon report, according to the report of the conference held in Winnipeg last fall, called by Premier Bracken, and according to the evidence of the committee appointed to investigate the charges made against Mr. Murray in 1935, and the evidence taken with respect to Bill No. 98, when it was considered in committee, it is clear that during the period Mr. McFarland was operating, and up to December 1, 1935, those operations made it possible for the farmers of Canada to sell in the neighbourhood of two billion bushels of wheat, all they had produced over that period at anywhere from 10 cents to 15 cents a bushel more than they would have received if that operation had not been conducted. In that respect I would refer hon. members to page 408 of the evidence, at which point Mr. McIvor gave a sworn statement to that effect. It will be seen if hon. members follow it through, that Mr. Ralston tried for nearly an hour to break down the evidence, but failed to do so. On that occasion Mr. McIvor struck to his ground, and gave the figures.

Then in 1932 the government of the day negotiated a trade agreement which gave us a preference of 6 cents a bushel in the British market. That was a most beneficial arrangement, but at this time I shall not go into details with respect to it.

Mention has been made of a London conference. I would say that in 1933 a world conference was held in London, on which occasion some agreement was arrived at with respect to exports and quotas. Canada was represented on that occasion by the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, who was Prime Minister at that time, and Mr. M. A. MacPherson, from the province of Saskatchewan. I should like to recall at this time that the agreement they tried to make was criticized by the party now in power in this House of Commons. Great criticism was lodged against the action of Mr. Bennett and Mr. MacPherson because they had agreed to an export quota.

At this point in my observations I shall come down to the present time. The minister has mentioned the representatives at a similar conference where they may come to some agreement. In my opinion there will be a great change in marketing in the next five years. I believe we must come to some agreement with respect to world exports and world

production. The situation is as bad as, if not worse than it was in 1933. I realize that the government are concerned in the matter, and while they may have opposed what was done on an earlier occasion, to-day they are giving it their consideration. We have representatives at the conference and I hope some of them will be clothed with authority to make a proper agreement, and help us in that way.

I would also point out that the Turgeon report has indicated what the stabilization operations of Mr. McFarland meant to Canada. If I cared to take the time I could quote from page 99 of the report of the Turgeon commission where Sir Herbert Robson, a grain merchant in Great Britain, is quoted. In effect he said that the operations of John I. McFarland were the means of saving the situation, so far as Canada was concerned, and had been of great benefit to the producers.

Then, at page 37 of the report there is a statement with respect to the McFarland operations to December 1, 1935. The statement shown on that page, and dated December 28, 1936, gives details with respect to the selling operations of the board following Mr. Murray's appointment as chairman. I do not wish to take time to comment on that statement further than to say that there is a statement here to the effect that there was a profit of \$24,000,000 on one operation and a loss of \$11,000,000 on the other. From the \$24,000,000 they subtracted the estimated loss of \$15,000,000, giving a net profit of almost \$9,000,000 on the first operation. The net loss, taking the two accounts, was only \$2,900,000.

I believe the report of the Canadian wheat board which I have in my hand, and which contains the figures I have set out—and I was speaking only in round numbers—should be placed in *Hansard*, so that the people of Canada might have an idea of exactly how those two accounts were handled, and what they meant. I refer to the table and part of the text at page 2 of the report of the Canadian wheat board for the crop year 1937-38. With the permission of the house I would ask that it be placed on *Hansard*.

Mr. SPEAKER: That may be done, if there is unanimous consent.

Mr. GARDINER: Agreed.

Mr. CRERAR: Is the hon. member putting on *Hansard* the whole report?

Mr. PERLEY: No, only page 2 which shows a statement of accounts.