

Vol. 87
No. 46

4th Session
20th Parliament



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Friday, March 12, 1948

Speaker: The Honourable GASPARD FAUTEUX

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.
KING'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1948

Price per copy, 5 cents; per session \$3. Address King's Printer, Ottawa, Canada.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 12, 1948

Hong Kong. Drew letter—Question and answer in British House of Commons, Mr. Mackenzie King.....	2145
Tariffs and Trade. Reference of subject matter of Geneva Trade Agreement to Banking and Commerce Committee. Motion, Mr. Mackenzie King; Mr. Bracken, Mr. Coldwell. Motion agreed to.....	2145
Wheat Board Act. Communications from western provinces as to complementary legislation, Mr. Castleden, Mr. Howe.....	2146
Business of the House. Suggested conference with respect to emergency legislation and Easter recess, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Mackenzie King.....	2146
Vegetables. Statement with respect to importation by air, Mr. Abbott.....	2147
Loans to Other Countries. Inquiry as to amounts not paid, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Smith (Calgary West), Mr. Fulton.....	2147
Reports and Papers. P.C. 637 and P.C. 804, orders in council dealing with Japanese in Canada, tabled, Mr. Mitchell.....	2147
United Nations. Temporary commission on Korea—Action of Canadian delegate, Mr. Graydon, Mr. St. Laurent.....	2147
Czechoslovakia. Inquiry as to Canadian loan, Mr. Thatcher, Mr. St. Laurent.....	2148
House of Commons. Audibility of debate and proceedings, Mr. Cruickshank.....	2148
Transitional Measures Act, 1947. Continuation of certain orders and regulations. Resolution, Mr. Isley, considered in committee and reported. Bill No. 136, Mr. Isley, first reading.....	2148
Canadian Wheat Board Act Amendment. Provision for employees' pensions; minimum price of wheat deliveries, etc. Bill No. 135. Motion, Mr. Howe, for second reading.....	2157
Debate continued by:	
Mr. Ross (Souris).....	2163
Mr. Tucker.....	2165
Mr. Wright.....	2171
Mr. Diefenbaker.....	2185
Mr. Faur.....	2190
Mr. Mutch.....	2192
Mr. Miller.....	2195
Debate adjourned on motion of Mr. Miller.....	2200
Private Bills:	
National General Insurance. Bill No. 48, Mr. Benidickson, considered in committee, third reading.....	2174
Eastern Trust Company. Bill No. 49, Mr. Isnor, considered in committee, third reading.....	2179
Trust and Loan Company of Canada. Bill No. 59, Mr. Pinard, considered in committee, third reading.....	2180
People's Fraternal Order. Bill No. 115, Mr. Cross, considered in committee, progress reported.....	2181

OFFICIAL REPORT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): There is a correction, Mr. Speaker, that I think should be made in *Hansard* of March 10, at page 2074. I had not had my attention drawn to it until a moment ago. It is in regard to the division that took place on the motion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition for the production of some papers respecting the Maltby report. *Hansard* records the result of the division as "Motion agreed to,

on division." I think all hon. members who were present at the time will agree that it should be, "Motion negatived." I should like to have that correction made in *Hansard*.

Mr. BRACKEN: Is the Prime Minister quite sure that it was negatived?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was never more sure of anything in my life.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, March 12, 1948

The house met at three o'clock.

HONG KONG

DREW LETTER—QUESTION AND ANSWER IN BRITISH HOUSE OF COMMONS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the doubts expressed and implications made, which are recorded in *Hansard*, as to statements of mine concerning communications between the Canadian government and the United Kingdom government respecting publication of the letter known as the Drew letter and the refusal of the United Kingdom government to allow the publication of certain telegrams exchanged between the United Kingdom and Canadian governments in 1941, I am sure hon. members will wish to have the following information on an exchange of question and answer which took place yesterday in the United Kingdom House of Commons. In justice to myself I feel this question and answer should also be recorded in *Hansard*.

The question appeared in the name of Mr. Quintin Hogg, Conservative M.P. for Oxford City. The text of the exchange is as follows:

Question: "Mr. Hogg to ask the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations what communications have passed between the Canadian and British governments relative to the publication of letters known as the Drew (Premier Drew of Ontario) letters concerning Canadian troops at Hong Kong and if he now agreed to their publication."

Answer: "There has been no correspondence between His Majesty's government in Canada and the United Kingdom about publication of letters from Colonel Drew to which the honourable member (Hogg) refers."

"The Canadian government inquired whether they might publish certain telegrams exchanged between the United Kingdom and the Canadian government in 1941 relating to the dispatch of Canadian forces to Hong Kong and to the situation in the Far East at that time."

"We replied agreeing to the publication of those telegrams which related to the dispatch of troops but we said that we felt unable to agree to the publication of telegrams relating to the international situation."

"Such telegrams are framed on the basis that they will not be published and the whole system of full and frank communication between His Majesty's governments would be prejudiced

if telegrams of this nature had to be prepared on the basis that this rule might not eventually be observed.

"The question was very carefully examined at the highest level and the United Kingdom regret that they cannot reconsider their decision."

TARIFFS AND TRADE

REFERENCE OF SUBJECT MATTER OF GENEVA TRADE AGREEMENT TO BANKING AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): It was announced last night, Mr. Speaker, that the first order to be called today would be the one which appears as No. 3 on the order paper with respect to the Geneva agreement. The purpose of calling that order today was to enable the subject matter of the trade agreement to be referred to the banking and commerce committee. The procedure in the house has always been to pass the second reading in the first instance, before assigning a bill by direction of the house to one committee or another. But hon. gentlemen opposite expressed the view earlier that it would be helpful if, before being asked to vote on the second reading, the subject matter could be referred to a committee, and the committee on banking and commerce was the committee agreed upon.

I just wish to point out, in order that this will not become a precedent, that it is quite exceptional to refer the subject matter of a resolution to a committee before the resolution itself has been voted upon. In order that the matter may be proceeded with in a regular way I would move, seconded by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent), the following motion, which serves the same end:

That the subject matter of the general agreement on tariffs and trade, including the protocol of provisional application thereof, together with the complementary agreement of October 30, 1947, between Canada and the United States of America, be referred to the standing committee on banking and commerce.

This is not a resolution and therefore no notice is required; if carried it will be an order of the house. But hon. members will see that it is to carry out the purpose that was intended, namely, to enable the house to have the subject matter of this agreement referred to the banking and commerce committee.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): If it is in order to deal with this matter now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a very brief comment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is debatable.

Mr. BRACKEN: My understanding is that if this motion is adopted it carries with it neither approval nor disapproval of the details of the resolution itself?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is correct.

Mr. BRACKEN: Our interpretation of the motion is that the resolution will be referred to a committee, there to be considered and sent back either with or without some recommendations, and that when it comes back to the house we will be free to deal with it as we choose. If that is the purpose of this motion, if that is what is to be accomplished, we will offer no objection at this time. But we want to reserve our right to take any attitude that seems necessary when it comes from the committee back to the house for further consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I explain the position exactly to my hon. friend. The motion is not to refer the resolution to the banking and commerce committee. It is to refer the subject matter of the resolution, which is the Geneva trade agreement, to enable the banking and commerce committee to call before it experts or anyone it may wish to call to give the committee such information as it may wish to have. When the committee has all the information it wishes on the subject matter of the trade agreement, then the resolution which is on the order paper, and which meanwhile will remain there as it is, will come up for debate in the house. The committee cannot change the terms of the agreement, but in committee an opportunity would be afforded to look into the details of the agreement.

Mr. COLDWELL: As I understand it, this is an international agreement between various countries of the world. As such I presume the house has to accept or reject it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is right.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is not the purpose of referring the subject matter to a committee to enable all the points to be elucidated?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is it.

Mr. COLDWELL: In order that members of parliament may understand them, so that we may either vote for or against the resolution?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the purpose.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. COLDWELL: That is my understanding.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is correct. Motion agreed to.

WHEAT BOARD ACT

COMMUNICATIONS FROM WESTERN PROVINCES AS TO COMPLEMENTARY LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether any communication has been received as yet from the government of Alberta or of Manitoba as to their readiness or intention to pass legislation with respect to the Canadian wheat board which would be complementary to the bill now before this house.

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Trade and Commerce): A communication has been received from Alberta, not from Manitoba.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED CONFERENCE WITH RESPECT TO EMERGENCY LEGISLATION AND EASTER RECESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister? In view of the number of items of business of an emergency character which have to be concluded before the end of March, and in view also of the general desire of hon. members for a little longer Easter recess than is indicated in the Prime Minister's motion—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. KNOWLES: Incidentally I note that the Prime Minister himself is to be in Virginia on April 2—would the Prime Minister consider calling together the leaders and whips of the various parties at this time to see whether arrangements can be made to get a certain amount of business through, and thus make possible a longer recess?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I have had the opportunity already of speaking to two of the leaders and saying I would like to have a word with them very shortly on the business of the house. This afternoon I hope to have a chance to speak to the other leader, to whom I have not spoken, and will indicate to him the same wish. I would hope to have a meeting with the three leaders today or possibly on Monday. As to a meeting of the leaders and whips, I think it would be preferable that I should

meet with the leaders to see if we can arrive at some appropriate arrangement, and later the whips might confer to see if they can carry out any plan that may be agreed upon.

VEGETABLES

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO IMPORTATION BY AIR FROM THE UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): Yesterday in my unavoidable absence the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. Probe) asked whether I was aware that certain fresh vegetables now banned from import to Canada from the United States were being flown into Canada daily from California by commercial aircraft and, if so, would I explain to the house why those vegetables were being permitted entry when ordinary bulk vegetables such as lettuce and celery were barred from import into Canada.

I am familiar with the situation, which is as follows. Fresh vegetables in their natural state have been placed on the prohibited list, of course with the exception of cabbage, carrots, potatoes and onions, under tariff item 87, which reads, "vegetables, fresh, in their natural state". Vegetables, fresh, in other than their natural state, that is to say cut up in any way, are classified under tariff item 711, and are permitted entry without permit. I have been informed that importers are now taking advantage of this tariff item and are importing in growing volume salad greens, that is vegetables cut or shredded, consisting of almost every variety of vegetables, as of course they are entitled to do. In order to maintain the ban on the importation of fresh vegetable salads I am recommending that order in council P.C. 4678 and Bill No. 3 be amended to include in the prohibited list cut or shredded vegetables classified under tariff item 711.

LOANS TO OTHER COUNTRIES

INQUIRY AS TO AMOUNTS NOT REPAYED

On the orders of the day:

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): The other day the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) asked a question about the repayment of certain Canadian loans and credits to foreign countries, and I apologize for not having answered the question before today. The situation is that all these loans are made under contracts, the terms of which call for repayment; and as Minister of Finance of course I expect that those contracts will be fulfilled. It is obvious

to anyone, I suppose, that there are risks involved in loans of this kind, and one would be showing a false sense of optimism if one expected there would be no losses before these loans were repaid. Members of the house will recall that we have set aside some \$25,000,000 each year out of current revenue to build up a reserve against assets of this kind, and of course that reserve is available.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): The Minister of Agriculture does not agree with you, does he?

Mr. FULTON: May I ask the Minister of Finance a supplementary question arising out of the statement he has just made? In view of the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) on February 27 that everyone in the house knows that a "considerable part" of the loan is "never going to be paid back", I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if he would be willing to let us have a further statement which would better reconcile the statements of the two ministers.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know that I have anything to add to what I said a minute ago.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table P.C. 637—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Louder.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is enough to have one loud-voiced person in the house. I wish to table P.C. 637 and P.C. 804, orders in council dealing with the Japanese in Canada.

UNITED NATIONS

TEMPORARY COMMISSION ON KOREA—ACTION OF CANADIAN DELEGATE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, has the Secretary of State for External Affairs any further information to convey to the house with respect to our position concerning the interim commission on Korea? When I asked the question earlier in the week he could not give full information; perhaps he could do so now.

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I am not yet in receipt of full information, although additional information was obtained by telephone communication with Canada's representative, Doctor Patterson. That is to be followed up by a dispatch which has not yet come to my

desk, and which had not reached the Department of External Affairs before eleven o'clock this morning. I am in a position to say, on the information obtained over the telephone, that there was no walk-out. The matter of the election was being discussed and at a given moment Doctor Patterson, for reasons that can be understood, retired for a few minutes and then came back while the meeting still continued. The fact that he had been out for a few moments was described by newspapermen as a walk-out. That was not so.

Mr. GRAYDON: I suppose that can be referred to as an unofficial walk-out.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Certainly one that had no international connotation.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

INQUIRY AS TO CANADIAN LOAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. R. THATCHER (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, on March 2 I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs what was going to be done with the balance of the Canadian loan to Czechoslovakia. Can he tell us that now?

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): There have been no advances made on the Czechoslovakian loan over the last three or four weeks, and no question of further advances has been raised.

Mr. THATCHER: Can the minister say whether the credits under the loan have been frozen by the Canadian government?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: We have been having some pretty cold weather, and I do not think there is apt to be very much change at an early date in the international atmosphere in that regard.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

AUDIBILITY OF DEBATE AND PROCEEDINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that some gentlemen are paid \$18,000 a year to tell the house and the press gallery what is going on, is any provision being made for the amplification of speeches so that we can hear the mumbling that goes on in this chamber?

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

TRANSITIONAL MEASURES ACT, 1947

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN ORDERS AND REGULATIONS

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the continuation of certain orders and regulations of the governor in council for a limited period during the national emergency arising out of the war.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister make a statement now?

Mr. ILSLEY: I believe it would be more appropriate if I were to make it in committee.

Mr. GRAYDON: Why would it be more appropriate?

Mr. IRVINE: Would the minister tell us what is before the house? We cannot hear.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They are just mumbling among themselves down there.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is item No. 16 on the order paper.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. ILSLEY: No; I should be very glad to have it carry, but I think I should say a few words about it, mainly for the information of hon. members.

I do not think the house will oppose the passage of this resolution in the terms in which it is drafted. The resolution states that it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the continuation of certain orders and regulations of the governor in council for a limited period during the national emergency arising out of the war. I believe there would be general agreement among members of the committee that some of the orders in council validated by legislation last year, and which have force until March 31 this year, must continue for a while at least after March 31, 1948.

The bill to be introduced will propose the continuation of the orders in council in force at the present time until March 31, 1949. It will not refer to the orders in council at all, but will be a bill for the continuation of and to amend the measure, so that instead of an expiration date of March 31, 1948, as it now

appears, the date of expiration of the measure will be March 31, 1949. There will be a provision, such as is found in the measure, for a further continuation for one additional year by address of the senate and the House of Commons, followed by an order in council, if that is felt desirable. That is the section contained in the present bill.

Mr. BENTLEY: Why did the minister not do that before Christmas, when we asked him to do it, and save all this time?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not think it would have saved time. As the situation developed before Christmas, perhaps it would have been the right thing to do; but we thought we had some sort of understanding with the leaders of the other parties that there would be a very short debate before Christmas on the basis that the orders in council would merely be continued until March 31, 1948. A long debate ensued, occupying a large part of the pre-Christmas session, and excluding the legislation we really wanted to pass during that period. Perhaps in the end it would have been all right to do the other; but that was not the understanding on which a great many members in the house felt they should desist from any discussion of the measure. If we had proposed that before Christmas we would have invited discussion of the orders in council themselves. Those orders in council were not discussed at all in the debate before Christmas. In that debate hon. members confined themselves to general principles.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is the minister sure there was a meeting of the leaders of the groups at which an extension to March 31 only was discussed? I do not think such a meeting was held.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not think there was a meeting.

Mr. KNOWLES: I think the minister assumed that there would be less trouble for three months than for the full year.

Mr. ILSLEY: I understood that certain leaders at any rate intimated that if it were merely an extension until March 31 there would be no exception taken because it would have gone on anyway to March 31 if we had not called parliament in December. We would have departed entirely from the spirit of that whole arrangement if we had branched out into a discussion of this measure as a measure for another year which would have involved an examination of the orders in council them-

selves. I think there will be general agreement that some orders in council must be extended beyond March 31 of this year.

Mr. LOW: Such as?

Mr. ILSLEY: Such as the orders relating to price control, rent control and eviction control. There are others, but I shall come to them later. For the information of hon. members I think I ought to say just what orders are extant at the present time and just what orders are revoked at the present time. I ought to give the members of the committee an indication of where they can get further and full information as to the terms of the order in council that really will be extended.

Mr. LOW: That is what we need.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes. Last year a list of fifty orders in council was appended to the Continuation of Transitional Measures Act, 1947. Of those, twenty-three have been wholly revoked since the passage of the act. Twenty-seven orders in council remain in force, but some of them have been partially revoked. This afternoon I should like to place on *Hansard* the details of what orders in council have been revoked and what orders in council are still extant. I think I shall have to do this by reading. It will be dry and it will take quite a lot of time, but I think the information should be put on *Hansard*.

Mr. LOW: We can take it; we are used to that.

Mr. ILSLEY: All right. The following are the orders in council which appeared in the schedule to the Continuation of Transitional Measures Act of last year which have been completely revoked.

Department of Agriculture. P.C. 5424 of 1944—I should say at this stage that in the material which I shall place on *Hansard* the exact dates of the order in council are given and the exact dates of revocation, but in reading I shall refer only to the year in order to save time.

Mr. MacNICOL: Would it not help to mention what each order refers to?

Mr. ILSLEY: Department of Agriculture. P.C. 5424 of 1944, agricultural food board regulations respecting recovery of subsidies; revoked by P.C. 5040 of 1947. P.C. 6759 of 1945, repayment of subsidy (agricultural products) regulations; revoked by P.C. 5040 of 1947.

Civil service commission. P.C. 8541-1/2 of 1941, preference respecting appointment to civil service, ex-servicemen of present war, as

amended by P.C. 4320 of 1945; revoked by P.C. 4632 of 1947; P.C. 15/1647 of 1945, veterans preference respecting appointments to the civil service, service on the high seas in a sea-going ship of war; revoked by P.C. 4632 of 1947. P.C. 16/1647 of 1945, veterans preference respecting appointments to the civil service, not applicable to certain classes in naval forces; revoked by P.C. 4632 of 1947.

Mr. BROOKS: The reason for revoking these is that they are now incorporated in certain acts?

Mr. ILSLEY: So I believe. The next is P.C. 20/6173 of 1945, civil service war service preference, certain persons excluded, as amended by P.C. 29/1046 of 1946; revoked by P.C. 4632 of 1947. P.C. 30/7500 of 1945, veterans preference respecting appointments to the public service, as amended by P.C. 19/3727 of 1946; revoked by P.C. 4632 of 1947.

Department of Finance. P.C. 394 of 1942, anthracite coal, importation exempted from customs duty, as extended by P.C. 3472 of 1942; revoked by P.C. 5085 of 1947. P.C. 9058 of 1942, bagging material, etcetera, importation exempt from customs duty; revoked by P.C. 5085 of 1947. P.C. 6497 of 1943, ration coupon banking, as amended by P.C. 626 of 1944; revoked by P.C. 498 of 1948.

Department of Fisheries. P.C. 6289 of 1943, regulations for control of salt fish and appointments thereunder; revoked by P.C. 4976 of 1947.

Department of Mines and Resources. P.C. 7167 of 1943, reserves to the crown radioactive substances in Yukon territory; revoked by P.C. 5282 of 1947. P.C. 7168 of 1943, reserves to the crown radioactive substances in Northwest Territories; revoked by P.C. 5282 of 1947.

Department of National Defence. P.C. 6638 of 1945, post-discharge benefits to the members of the armed forces serving in an interim force; revoked by P.C. 5085 of 1947. P.C. 3617 of 1946, naval, military and air force estates regulations, 1946; revoked by P.C. 5005 of 1947. P.C. 349 of 1947, regulations respecting claims by or against the crown involving members of the naval, military or air forces of Canada overseas; revoked by P.C. 5005 of 1947. P.C. 363 of 1947, consolidated regulations respecting salvage services by H.M.C. ships; revoked by P.C. 5005 of 1947.

Department of National Health and Welfare. There are four orders in council referring to old age pensions.

Department of Transport. P.C. 3396 of 1946, merchant seamen out of work allowance regulations; revoked by P.C. 4939 of 1947. P.C. 133/510 of 1944, compensation to seamen,

[Mr. Ilesley.]

war damage to effects, regulations 1939, as amended by certain orders in council mentioned here; revoked by P.C. 498 of 1948. Those complete the list of revocation.

Now come the partial revocations. P.C. 5518 of 1943, repayment of subsidy order; order amended by P.C. 4815 of 1947 which revokes subsections (2) and (3) of section 4 and renumbers subsections (4), (5) and (6) as (2), (3) and (4) respectively. I think it is incorrect to say "amended by." There is really no power of amendment. It should be "partially revoked by."

Department of Fisheries. P.C. 251 of 1942, fishing licences prohibited to persons of Japanese racial origin, revoked as of April 1, 1949, by P.C. 804 of 1948.

Department of Labour. P.C. 946, 1943, evacuation and relocation of persons of the Japanese race in Canada, as amended by certain orders described here, paragraphs (ii) of (vii) of subsection (1) of section 3, revoked by P.C. 804 of 1948. Total revocation as of April 1, 1949, by P.C. 804, 1948, and P.C. 7355 of 1945, being financial assistance to voluntary repatriates to Japan and liquidation and transfer of their assets to Japan as amended by P.C. 268, January 23, 1947, amended by P.C. 637 of 1948, revoked, except in so far as it affects or relates to persons who, having made a request for repatriation, have proceeded to Japan prior to December 5, 1947.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Has the minister the dates for the last orders in council?

Mr. ILSLEY: I said 1948, but the exact date is the 2nd day of March, 1948.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister indicated that P.C. 946 has already been made the subject of final revocation as of a date he gave?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: What is the date?

Mr. ILSLEY: April 1, 1949.

Mr. KNOWLES: It should have been sooner, but it is good to see it go. These are the orders in council tabled today by the Minister of Labour?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes. If hon. members wish to get full information about these important orders in council they may get it from the copies of the orders in council that were laid on the table today by the Minister of Labour. He tabled two orders in council which have the effect that I have briefly described in the information I have given to the house, and I understand that if members desire further copies they are obtainable from the privy council office.

I have given the orders in council that have been revoked, those that have been revoked wholly and those that have been revoked partially. I have a list of the orders in council which remain, and with the consent of the committee I will put them on *Hansard* without reading them, because that is tiresome.

Mr. KNOWLES: Those are the ones in which no changes have been made?

Mr. ILSLEY: Those in which no changes have been made.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the minister leave to put the list on the record?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is not quite right to say that they are the ones in which no changes have been made. The ones that have been partially revoked will be part of the orders in council still operative, and those are in this list that I am about to place on *Hansard*. My suggestion would be that if hon. members have the office consolidation of the orders in council of last year they can easily, with the information I am giving the committee this afternoon and placing on *Hansard*, go through it and with a lead pencil prepare a complete statement of exactly what is being continued. Hon. members will probably have to have last year's act before them.

Mr. KNOWLES: With respect to the list the minister is placing on *Hansard* now, of orders in council still in effect, does it include P.C. 1665 under the department of the Secretary of State, administration by the custodian of property of persons of the Japanese race? There has been no change in that as yet?

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. KNOWLES: And is the same true of P.C. 469?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, the same is true.

I have not very much more to say at this time. I hope that the resolution will go through this afternoon, without much discussion, because I think that this is one of the occasions when the house can save time. I say that because it will give me an opportunity to introduce the bill and hon. members will have before them all the information that is important. Then when the bill comes on for second reading the principle can be discussed. The house can take such action as it sees fit with regard to them.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I say a word with regard to the procedure suggested by the Minister of Justice? I agree as to the desirability of having discussion in as few stages of

the debate as possible, but it seems to me a difficulty arises and we must have some undertaking as to how we shall deal with it. Last year when the bill was before us the schedule to the bill included a list of all orders in council covered, which meant that when we got to the schedule we could express our views regarding individual orders, and in some cases we moved amendments or forced a vote to try to delete them, whether we were successful or otherwise. But this year the minister indicates that the bill he will bring in, based upon this resolution, is a very simple one which merely changes the expiry date—

Mr. ILSLEY: That is right.

Mr. KNOWLES:—in the act that is now on the statute book. I can see a member attempting on the second reading of the bill to discuss the orders in council having regard to the Canadians of Japanese origin, and being told by Mr. Speaker that that is pretty far afield from the general principle of the bill and that we cannot do it on second reading, and then when we get into committee on the bill these individual items will not be before us at all. All we shall have is one or two sections of the bill. I am prepared to leave the discussion to the second reading of the bill or in committee on the bill. As a matter of fact, the committee stage would be better because we could have a back-and-forth discussion with the minister. But I would not want to let this stage go by unless we have an undertaking from the minister or the chairman that at some future stage we can go into details if we wish.

Mr. ILSLEY: I have not consulted with the Chairman or with the Speaker, but I foresee exactly the situation that my hon. friend has outlined and I will take no exception. In fact, I will favour the course of action I am now about to describe, that is to say, that members will be free in committee on the bill to discuss any of these orders in council. And moreover, they will be free, so far as I am concerned, unless I am prevented in some way by the rules, to propose amendments to specific orders in council on the bill.

The bill is an amending bill. There may be some questions about the rules of order, whether other amendments can be proposed, but I think the house ought to be free in committee to discuss the details. Of course, no action could be taken on second reading except something attacking the whole principle of the bill, but when we get into committee on the bill I think the house must be free to discuss price control or the policy with reference to Japanese, or those other matters that I have outlined. The house must be free to do that. I am not inviting this discussion. In fact, I do not want

the discussion, as far as that goes, but I have to see, as far as I can, that the house has an opportunity to discuss these details. I will now put the list on *Hansard*:

ORDERS IN COUNCIL IN SCHEDULE

To the Continuation of Transitional Measures Act

Revocations

Department of Agriculture

P.C. 5424, 14/7/44—Agricultural food board regulations respecting recovery of subsidies. Revoked by P.C. 5040, 8/12/47.
P.C. 6759, 6/11/45—The repayment of subsidy (agricultural products) regulations. Revoked by P.C. 5040, 8/12/47.

Civil Service Commission

P.C. 85413, 1/11/41—Preference respecting appointments to civil service ex-service men of present war as amended by P.C. 4320, 20/6/45.
P.C. 15/1647, 9/3/45—"Veterans preference" respecting appointments to the civil service—service on the high seas in a sea-going ship of war. Revoked by P.C. 4632, 12/11/47.
P.C. 16/1647, 9/3/45—"Veterans preference" respecting appointments to the civil service—not applicable certain classes in naval forces. Revoked by P.C. 4632, 12/11/47.
P.C. 20/6173, 21/9/45—Civil service war service preference—certain persons excluded, as amended by P.C. 29/1046, 22/3/46. Revoked by P.C. 4632, 12/11/47.

P.C. 30/7500, 29/12/45—"Veterans preference" respecting appointments to the public service as amended by P.C. 19/3727, 5/9/46. Revoked by P.C. 4632, 12/11/47.

Department of Finance

P.C. 394, 20/1/42—Anthracite coal—importation exempted from customs duty, as extended by P.C. 3472, 28/4/42. Revoked by P.C. 5085, 11/12/47.

P.C. 9058, 6/10/42—Bagging material, etc.—importation exempt from customs duty. Revoked by P.C. 5085, 11/2/47.

P.C. 6497, 17/8/43—Ration coupon banking as amended by P.C. 626, 3/2/44. Revoked by P.C. 498, 10/2/48.

Department of Fisheries

P.C. 6289, 6/8/43—Regulations for control of salt fish and appointments thereunder. Revoked by P.C. 4976, 3/12/47.

Department of Mines and Resources

P.C. 7167, 15/9/43—Reserves to the crown radio-active substances in Yukon Territory. Revoked by P.C. 5282, 30/12/47.

P.C. 7168, 15/9/43—Reserves to the crown radio-active substances in Northwest Territories. Revoked by P.C. 5282, 30/12/47.

Department of National Defence

P.C. 6638, 23/10/45—Post-discharge benefits to the members of the armed forces serving in an interim force. Revoked by P.C. 5085, 11/12/47.

P.C. 3617, 27/8/46—Naval, military and air force estates regulations, 1946. Revoked by P.C. 5005, 8/12/47.

P.C. 349, 31/1/47—Regulations respecting claims by or against the crown involving members of the naval, military or air forces of Canada (overseas). Revoked by P.C. 5005, 8/12/47.

[Mr. Ilesley.]

P.C. 363, 31/1/47—Consolidated regulations respecting salvage services by H.M.C. ships. Revoked by P.C. 5005, 8/12/47.

Department of National Health and Welfare

P.C. 6367, 10/8/43—Old age pensions. Revoked by P.C. 3644, 9/9/47.

P.C. 8341, 28/10/43—Old age pensions. Revoked by P.C. 5085, 11/12/47.

P.C. 3377, 29/5/44—Old age pensions. Revoked by P.C. 3644, 9/9/47.

P.C. 6500, 18/8/44—Old age pensions. Revoked by P.C. 5085, 11/12/47.

Department of Transport

P.C. 3396, 9/8/46—Merchant seamen out-of-work allowance regulations. Revoked by P.C. 4939, 3/12/47.

P.C. 133/510, 26/1/44—Compensation to seamen (war damage to effects) regulations, 1939, as amended by P.C. 127/1111-21/2/45, 109/2100-28/3/45, 148/5045-18/7/45. Revoked by P.C. 498, 10/2/48.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL IN SCHEDULE

To the Continuation of Transitional Measures Act

Partial Revocations

War-time Prices and Trade Board

P.C. 5518, 16/7/43—Repayment of subsidy order. Partially revoked by P.C. 4815, 26/11/47 revoked subsections (2) and (3) of section 4 and renubers subsections (4), (5) and (6) of such section as (2), (3) and (4) respectively.

Department of Fisheries

P.C. 251, 13/1/42—Fishing licence—prohibited to persons of Japanese racial origin. Revoked as of April 1, 1949 by P.C. 804, 2/3/48.

Department of Labour

P.C. 946, 5/2/43—Evacuation and relocation of persons of the Japanese race in Canada as amended by: 9743, 24/12/43; 5637, 16/8/45; 5793, 18/12/45; 5973, 14/9/45; 270, 23/1/47. Paras. (ii) and (vii) of subsection (1) of section 3 revoked by P.C. 804, 2/3/48.

Total revocation as of April 1, 1949 by P.C. 804, 2/3/48.

P.C. 7355, 15/12/45—Financial assistance to voluntary repatriates to Japan and liquidation and transfer of their assets to Japan as amended by P.C. 268, January 23, 1947. Amended by P.C. 637, 20/2/48 revoked except in so far as it affects or relates to persons who, having made a request for repatriation, have proceeded to Japan prior to the fifth day of December, 1947.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL IN SCHEDULE

To the Continuation of Transitional Measures Act which are to be continued beyond

March 31, 1948

Department of Finance

P.C. 8042, 9/9/42—Coke made from coal exempt from war exchange tax when used as a fuel for cooking or baking foods or for heating buildings, etc.

P.C. 9781, 24/12/43—Well-drilling machinery, etc., tariff treatment.

War-time Prices and Trade Board

P.C. 8528, 1/11/41—War-time prices and trade regulations as amended.

P.C. 9029, 21/11/41—War-time leasehold regulations as amended.

P.C. 9870, 17/12/41—Authorizing incorporation commodity prices stabilization corporation as amended.

P.C. 7475, 26/8/42—Regulations of corporation as amended.

P.C. 5518, 16/7/43—Repayment of subsidy order as amended.

P.C. 34/4433, 10/6/44—Government Employees Compensation Act extended to C.P.S.C. etc., employees.

P.C. 3122, 25/7/46—Consolidation of supplementary regulations.

P.C. 328, 28/1/47—Canadian Sugar Stabilization Corporation Ltd.

Department of Fisheries

P.C. 4112, 30/5/44—Enacting the Pelagic Sealing Regulations.

P.C. 251, 13/1/42—Fishing licence—prohibited to persons of Japanese racial origin.

Department of Justice

P.C. 4600, 7/6/43—Authorizing appeals in cases involving breaches of wartime regulations as amended.

P.C. 6223, 6/8/43—Notice to Attorneys General of Canada and of province in certain cases.

Department of Labour

P.C. 1003, 17/2/44—War-time labour relations regulations as amended.

P.C. 946, 5/2/43—Evacuation and relocation of persons of the Japanese race in Canada as amended.

P.C. 7355, 15/12/45—Financial assistance to voluntary repatriates to Japan and for liquidation and transfer of their assets to Japan as amended.

Department of Reconstruction and Supply

P.C. 1609, 23/4/46—Construction materials regulations established, as amended.

P.C. 9439, 19/12/44—Emergency shelter regulations as amended.

P.C. 7502, 28/12/45—Emergency shelter regulations transferred to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

P.C. 3, 4/1/44—War-time industries control regulations as amended.

P.C. 245, 23/1/46—Steel regulations as amended.

P.C. 1997, 21/3/44—Timber regulations.

Department of the Secretary of State

P.C. 1665, 4/3/42—Administration by custodian of property of persons of the Japanese race as amended.

P.C. 469, 19/1/43—Transfer to custodian of property of Japanese evacuees as amended.

Department of Transport

P.C. 2245, 23/3/42—To authorize the chairman of the board of steamship inspection to relieve any ship from the obligation to comply with any of the provisions of Part VII of the Canada Shipping Act, excepting those provisions of the said Part relating to radio telegraph installations on ships.

P.C. 4306, 17/6/41—To provide for permission to Canadian registered ships to clear on a voyage with masters, mates or engineers not holding appropriate certificates as amended.

Mr. KNOWLES: I appreciate the position the minister takes, and the committee I think will recognize, as will the chairman, that it is very fair. Let me state a case in point with reference to the minister's feeling that we

should be in a position to move amendments. He indicated today that P.C. 946 has been made the subject of another order in council finally revoking it as of April 1, 1949.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLES: Suppose I wish to move an amendment to change the date of April 1, 1949, to April 1, 1948, can the minister give me any free legal advice as to how it might be done?

Mr. ILSLEY: There is a passage in May that is not too helpful on this proposal. What I have in mind all along was that if an hon. member wished to do that he would move an amendment to this bill adding a specific section that order in council so and so should be changed or dropped.

Mr. KNOWLES: Thank you.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think the procedure that has been indicated by the Minister of Justice is fair, and I also think it is according to the rules of the house. When a bill is proposed to amend a time section of an act my understanding is that the act as a whole is open for amendment. I believe there was a ruling made in that regard at one time on a question raised by the then hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

This is a very important matter. I do not think it helps us very much to have the minister say that he is willing to do so and so. I appreciate that, and I would appreciate it if the chairman also said it, but neither of them controls the house.

Mr. KNOWLES: No, but he has quoted May.

Mr. MacINNIS: He said May was not very helpful; perhaps May never is. Therefore if some hon. member raises a point of order the chairman is bound to decide that point of order not on what the minister has said or on what he thinks himself, but on the rules of the house. I believe there is a rule which permits any amendment to be made once there is an amendment to an act.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is my understanding of it.

Mr. BRACKEN: As the minister has pointed out, this resolution is preparatory to the continuance of a measure passed some two or three years ago, a measure which continued in effect some fifty orders in council. The minister has indicated today that some of these orders in council have been revoked partially, some revoked wholly and some are being continued in effect. This is the first time we have had that statement. We cannot

therefore be expected to discuss a measure of this kind intelligently at the moment. The suggestion of the minister is a very good one, that the major debate, whatever it may be, should be left to second reading.

This is the resolution stage preparatory to the introduction of a bill. The minister indicates that the bill will be very short; it will not have all the details that it has had in the past. It is pointed out that we shall have them from other sources and they will be available and subject to discussion. We gather that the bill in principle will be the same as the bills we have dealt with on three or four other occasions, but covering a less extensive number of orders and controls. I think it is very desirable to save time at this stage if we can do so. But I want it understood that if we pass this resolution now without much debate we have our rights reserved to oppose it or support certain sections of it when the time comes for doing so.

With respect to the general principle of this control measure, our position is well known. We supported it generally during the war period; during the immediate post-war period we favoured an orderly decontrol. As we got into the peacetime period it was our view that many of these controls were resulting in lessened production, and many of them were doing more harm than good. Many of us feel that one in particular, the rent control, should not be abandoned precipitately. We think that if we are to get rid of it, it should be done in an orderly fashion.

We have had this measure before us on four different occasions—this is the fifth—and each time it is brought back to us the government seems to have made very little progress in extricating itself from its wartime controls. Generally speaking, we think many of these controls result in lessened production and therefore do more harm than good. I am not going to take more time now to discuss this matter in detail. We are agreeable to having the resolution passed at this stage, subject to the understanding that we can take any position we choose when the measure comes back to us. Then we will have before us the orders that are being continued, as indicated by the minister this afternoon, and then we will know what ones have been discontinued. I think, Mr. Chairman, we can save a good deal of the time of the house if that general procedure is accepted now, subject to the understanding that on second reading, and when we go into committee on the bill after second reading, we shall be free to take any position we think wise with respect to the support or otherwise of the different sections of the measure.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Mr. POULIOT: I am sorry not to be in a position to accept the advice of the leader of the opposition. He has said: Well, we should swallow this resolution and wait until the bill is before the committee to discuss the matter and to ask for more information. In my opinion, sir, the rules of the house are apropos and very wise. They were drafted by men who had the respect of law, men who knew that laws could not be made by the barrel, could not be made by the ton. They knew that an enactment is a matter of great importance because it affects everybody in this country. We are at the initial stage of the discussion, not the debate. The debate is on the second reading of the bill, but this is the initial stage of the discussion of a measure. The opposition is against control. The government is to reduce controls progressively. I personally am against controls.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Rent control?

Mr. POULIOT: If my hon. friend does not know that, he has not followed the debates since he has been a member of parliament. He knows that I am against all controls because they are an infringement on the liberty of the citizens of this country. But I will say more to him. There are some newcomers, like the leader of the opposition, for whom I have great respect, who say: We will save the time of the house by not discussing anything now; we will wait until the bill is before the committee. He does not realize the importance of the resolution. The very purpose of the resolution, especially when it is before the committee of the whole, is to give hon. members the opportunity to notify the government as to the information that they want to get before the second reading of the bill. This is the time to ask for that information in order that hon. members may be well posted and well informed when they discuss the principle of the bill. Where the first reading of the bill passes unnoticed, it is on the second reading that we discuss the principle of the bill. If we want information we ask the government for it when the bill is in the committee stage; therefore hon. members get the information after they have committed themselves on the principle of the bill. In other words the members must make their decision promptly, and it is a most important decision. How many rulings have I not heard in committee to the effect that the merits of the matter may not be discussed in committee? The member is bound by the vote he has given on second reading, and that is that. Is that not true, Mr. Chairman? How many times have you called members to order just because they were opposing the

principle of a bill in the committee stage? Therefore I will tell the minister what kind of information I want to have, and I want to have it for the benefit of my fellow colleagues of the House of Commons. What does it mean to me if I hear that an order in council has been repealed entirely or in part? The minister surely told the truth. I admit that he must have told the truth. I believe him.

Mr. GREEN: He always tells the truth.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, he always believes that he tells the truth. That is why I said he was honest. But he may make some errors occasionally, and he will not mind my saying that.

Mr. KNOWLES: He is always careful.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes; *errare humanum est*—to err is human. The fact that one order in council has been repealed in part or in full is just some more paper; the effect of it is what members of parliament are interested in. Members of parliament who denounce bureaucracy are interested in that repeal or in that change, whether you call it an amendment or something else, from the point of view of the number of bureaucrats that have been dispensed with as a result of such repeal or such change. Therefore my question now to the minister is quite clear, and it is this. I want to know how many men and women were employed by virtue of all those orders in council, and how many have been shifted to other departments because they personally were found to be indispensable, although the work they did under the repealed orders in council was no longer considered indispensable. In the first place, how many were dispensed with entirely from the service? How many were shifted from the bodies created by the orders in council to another branch of the dominion government? How many are still in the pay of the dominion government for the purpose of rendering some services in the bodies that are kept up by the orders in council which have not been entirely repealed?

To turn now, for instance, to price control and the wartime prices and trade board, this is exactly the kind of economic council which was established by Mr. Bennett by virtue of his social legislation, and which I denounced in the house. I succeeded in getting it taken completely out of the statute book. If any hon. member takes the trouble to look at the statutes of 1936, he will see that in that book there is a short piece of legislation entitled "An act to repeal the Economic Council Act." I was the mover of that resolution. To me it is absurd that men in the government service, deputy ministers and others, should form an

underground government to make policies as was done in the wartime prices and trade board. Let us look at those who composed that organization. Some of them are fine fellows. There are, of course, degrees of fineness among those who sat on that board. But men in various departments were taken from the work they had to do in order to meet together and decide about the prices that the people would have to pay in this country. I still think that the prices should be established by order of the Minister of Labour. I think it should be done by order in council, but on the recommendation of the Department of Labour and not under the wartime prices and trade board.

Perhaps I should qualify what I say in this way. If we find it necessary to establish prices, for instance, for agricultural products, those prices should be established by the Minister of Agriculture, but the salaries and wages should be determined by the Minister of Labour who is responsible to the government of this country, and members of parliament would be able to get much more information than we can get now from the wartime prices and trade board. I say nothing about the present chairman of that institution, because he is a much finer gentleman than was his illustrious predecessor. We can talk to him; he is sensible; he listens to us. I know that he wants to do a good job. But the trouble with these organizations that are not responsible to parliament is that those men who have fat salaries are most of the time considered infallible. They consider themselves infallible and they are considered by the government as infallible.

I hope the minister will be kind enough to give the information I have asked for, either at three o'clock on the day he brings in the bill or at any time before the bill is brought in, so that we shall know what progress has been made in the abolition of controls. Control is a form of despotism. Control is the antithesis of free enterprise. Control is the policy of the socialist party all over the world. That is why I as a Liberal am strongly opposed to control.

An hon. MEMBER: You are not doing badly.

Mr. POULIOT: There are some gentlemen who believe in control. It gives them importance. They like the strait-jacket and they are happy when they are not free. I am happy when I am free. The farmers of my district; those who work, on the railways and anywhere else; the merchants and all others want to be free. They want no controls. Here we have a measure of control. I am surprised that the leader of the opposition did not have

indigestion, when he was so ready to swallow the resolution preceding the bill. He is against controls, but he says: that resolution tastes good; I will swallow it right away. He has swallowed it. Here we have imitative harmony.

Here we are, Mr. Chairman, so far in the control business that we cannot dispense with it. It is nearly three years since hostilities ceased but the controls still exist and we cannot say to the people of this country we will have no more controls. If controls are necessary, that may be established; but I know and the committee knows there are some controllers who are useless but who are well paid, like the man who is writing his memoirs. His job is finished. He has nothing to do. He is still paid, so he writes his memoirs for the next war. I wonder if these men cannot be fired at once. Then we will have so much less to pay in taxes. I hope the control bodies will be gone over with a fine comb so that both the big ones and the little ones will be combed out, to the great benefit, pleasure, enjoyment and relief of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. KNOWLES: Just one further word, to go back to what we were discussing with the Minister of Justice a little earlier. Despite what has just been said by the hon. member for Temiscouata I think it is a good idea to get this stage of the debate over and get on to the second reading stage, but I do feel it is important that we protect our right to move amendments in committee on the bill. The minister's suggestion that there was something in May which was not too helpful led me to look into May, and I think it is fairly helpful if you read May closely. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I think citation 670 of Beauchesne, third edition, might be put on the record:

In committee all the clauses of the bill are considered before any new clauses are brought up and added to the bill. But this practice is not rigorously followed and the committee is generally guided by what is most convenient in each particular case.

That seems to imply pretty clearly that the adding of new clauses is in order. The only question in that citation is whether the committee has to wait until all the clauses in the bill have been dealt with or whether new clauses can be put in as we go along. The citation from Beauchesne, which I have just read, refers also to May. I have in my hand May, thirteenth edition, and I think I should read a few sentences from pages 410 and 411.

In the Lords, new clauses are brought up and inserted in their proper places, while the committee are going through the bill; but in the

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Commons, all the clauses of the bill are considered before any new clauses are brought up and added to the bill; though new clauses have been considered before postponed clauses. The new clauses proposed by the minister, or other member in charge of the bill, are considered before other new clauses. Members desiring to offer new clauses are called upon in the order in which their names appear upon the notice paper and before those members who have not given notice of their new clauses.

That, of course, has reference to a slightly different practice followed in the parliament at Westminster, where notices of amendments in committee also have to be put on the notice paper, unlike the situation here. There is this further paragraph:

If a new clause be offered, the chairman desires the member to bring it up, and it is read the first time without question put. A question is then put for reading the clause a second time, and, if this is agreed to, the clause may be amended before the question is put for adding it to the bill.

I thought these references from Beauchesne and May might be cited at this time so there could be no doubt about the intention of the committee, namely that when we do reach committee on the bill we shall have the right to move, by way of amendment, additional clauses to the bill in the form the Minister of Justice suggested.

Mr. LOW: I presume when the minister brings in the bill, either on the motion for second reading or in committee, he will be prepared to provide us with justification for the extension of these controls. Naturally we would like a chance to look over and study the list he has given us today, and I think the procedure he is following is generally good. When the bill does come in, however, we would like the minister to give us justification for the extension. We have taken the position generally that while controls may be necessary to tide us over a hard time, a time of dislocation, until things become more or less settled, generally we are against controls because, like the hon. member for Temiscouata, we feel that they unnecessarily curtail the freedom of the people. But whatever the government can justify at this time we are prepared to grant.

Mr. ILSLEY: The ministers having the administration of the various orders in council will be prepared to justify their extension.

Resolution reported, on division, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Ilsley thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 136, to amend the Continuation of Transitional Measures Act, 1947.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MARCH 12, 1948

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT PROVISION FOR EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS. MINIMUM PRICE OF WHEAT DELIVERIES, ETC.

Right Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill No. 135, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1935.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Last evening it was indicated by all groups in the opposition that it was their desire that this bill be divided into two parts, one part to be enacted at this time and the other part to be referred to the agriculture committee. It might be well to state the procedure that will be followed if that proves to be the wish of the house. The procedure will be that after Bill No. 135 has been read a second time, before the motion is put that Mr. Speaker leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole on the said bill I will move that it be an instruction to the committee of the whole that they have power to divide Bill 135 into two bills, in order that one bill may deal separately with oats and barley. When the house is in committee I shall ask one of my colleagues to move that section 5 be deleted from Bill 135 and that it be embodied in a separate bill. When the committee has reported Bill 135 with an amendment, and has at the same time reported progress on Bill 136—

Mr. BRACKEN: May I interrupt the minister to ask a question? He refers to section 5. I have not a copy of this bill; has it been distributed?

Mr. HOWE: It has been distributed, yes. When and if the committee has reported Bill 135 with an amendment, and has at the same time reported progress on Bill 136 and asked leave to sit again on Bill 136, and when Mr. Speaker asks when the committee shall have leave to sit again, then I shall move that Bill 136 be referred for consideration and report to the standing committee on agriculture and colonization.

I make this statement to indicate the government's plan, which has been worked out in consultation with the law officers, and is considered a proper manner in which to split a bill. If this procedure meets with the approval of the house I shall proceed in that fashion.

Mr. BRACKEN: I understand the minister is now discussing procedure, not the merits of the measure.

Mr. HOWE: That is right.

Mr. BRACKEN: Then, under the proposed procedure are we asked to approve all sections of the bill on second reading?—because if we

are not, one difficulty would be removed. If we are, I am afraid we could not agree to approval of all sections of the bill now.

Mr. HOWE: As I understand the situation, there is no known method by which a bill can be divided until we get into committee; and we cannot get into committee until we have had second reading. My hon. friend will appreciate that he is not committed to the bill simply by its having had second reading. The new bill will go to the committee on agriculture and can be returned as amended. After it is returned it can be rejected either by the government or the opposition. I scarcely think any commitment is involved.

Mr. BRACKEN: Is it correct that it is not the minister's intention, if the bill gets second reading that we shall be committed to all sections of it? Ordinarily when second reading is given one is committed to the principle or principles of the bill.

Mr. HOWE: I believe I can relieve my hon. friend's mind by saying that after the bill is divided it will come out of committee as two separate bills with separate numbers. Either bill can be defeated in committee or in the house; there need be no commitment so far as the oats and barley section is concerned.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That may be a very good explanation, but it is scarcely in accordance with parliamentary procedure. We find in Bill 135 that part IV-A provides for a new section 29A, and deals with oats and barley. Why should there not be a motion by the minister to delete that part from Bill 135—call it 135A, if you like? Then the only bill before the house would be Bill 135 rather than 135A. I say that because a vote cast in favour of second reading, regardless of any explanation the minister may give, will actually signify approval of the bill as constituted and placed before the House of Commons.

Mr. TUCKER: Much as I would like to see these cheques authorized and sent out to the wheat growers of western Canada at the earliest possible moment—and particularly so far as Saskatchewan is concerned, owing to the crop failure in about half of that province, and the further fact that they are relying on receipt of these cheques and prairie farm assistance cheques to help put their crops in—it seems to me most unfortunate that the desire to get these cheques out should be used by the opposition to force the taking of a step which would make it impossible to have a bill which would provide, along with the necessary supplementary legislation passed by the provinces—

Mr. BRACKEN: Are we now dealing with a point of order, or is this a debate on the bill?

Mr. TUCKER: A point of order.

Mr. BRACKEN: I respectfully suggest the hon. member is dealing with the bill itself rather than a point of order.

Mr. HOWE: If we may continue the discussion on the point of order, may I say that the hon. member for Lake Centre and I are not far apart. Instead of calling it Bill 135A as possible we will resolve the oats and barley section into Bill 136. There will be no commitment so far as the government is concerned in respect of Bill 136. It will not be considered as a commitment if the bill as now written receives its second reading.

Mr. MILLER: If we have second reading of Bill 135 then we certainly would not have another second reading. It would be a second reading of Bill 135 and Bill 136, in effect.

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. MILLER: And if we do not discuss on second reading the part that is to be included in Bill 136, namely part IV-A, as I understand it would never have another chance, because when the bill is reported from committee of the whole as Bill 136 the second reading has been completed.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I say a word or two on the point of order?

Mr. MILLER: Would the minister answer my question first?

Mr. HOWE: That is true; there would be no second reading of Bill 136 if we follow the method proposed. There would be a third reading; but I would assume hon. members would wish to have a discussion of Bill 136 in the committee on agriculture.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I say a word with respect to the point of order? First of all I support the minister's contention that if a bill is to be divided into two parts this is the only way it can be done. Bourinot, fourth edition, pages 525 and 526, indicates clearly that the only way to consolidate two bills, or to divide one bill into two or more bills, is to do it in committee of the whole house, after second reading, and precisely as the minister has said. As to the awkward position in which my hon. friends to my right find themselves, may I say I do not see how they can get out of it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is not an awkward position at all.
[Mr. Tucker.]

Mr. KNOWLES: As to the position, that my hon. friends are in, I think they are right in contending that a vote for second reading approves the principle of the whole thing.

One other point, so that the record may be kept clear on it. The minister referred to the second bill as Bill 136. I would remind him that in the meantime the Minister of Justice has introduced a bill which will probably bear the number 136, so the second part of the bill proposed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce perhaps ought not to be numbered just yet. This is a minor point, but I think it should be mentioned.

Mr. HOWE: If I might clear that up, we have been informed that the number 136 has been reserved for this bill. However if the Minister of Justice in the meantime has pre-empted the number 136, then it will be 137.

Mr. ILSLEY: I will yield.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Are we through with procedure now?

Mr. WRIGHT: No. On the question of procedure it would appear that the Progressive Conservative party object to voting on the principle with oats and barley included. So far as we were concerned, in referring this bill to the committee on agriculture and colonization our first objective was to get the payments out on the wheat participation certificates as soon as possible. Secondly, we believed that by referring it to the agriculture committee we could expedite the agreement and the complementary legislation that will have to be passed in connection with oats and barley and other products covered by the bill. If our friends to the right are going to delay the matter now, then so far as we are concerned we are prepared to deal with the whole bill as it stands.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, there is a simple way to deal with this matter, so simple that no one has thought of it. The minister could easily withdraw this bill and bring down two good bills. We complain that the legislation is obscure, that no one can understand it. If we had two bills those who voted for the principle of one bill would know what they were voting for. If they were for one bill they could vote for it, and if they were for the other bill, they could vote for that. But if they were against either bill they would not be bound by a vote which was given against their will.

This legislation is of supreme importance. The minister has had too much experience, he is too broadminded to force bad legislation

upon the House of Commons. Very often legislation is drafted by minor clerks. We cannot go on with separate bills before the committee. Section 29A refers to oats and barley. It is provided by that section that the words "oats and barley" shall replace the word "wheat" where it appears in the legislation concerning the wheat board. This is bad legislation. The minister is not stubborn; he is open minded and broad minded; he is full of good sense, and I am sure he realizes that this legislation cannot go through as it is.

We want good legislation, and it is time we had it, because we have had bad legislation for fifteen years. This is the time to start to have good legislation, and the best way to make it good is to have it acceptable to all. As it is now there is not a farmer in the west or in the east who could understand it. Those who deal with grain of any kind will have to go to great expense in order to have the opinion of eminent counsel on the effect of the legislation. It is to avoid these legal difficulties that I suggest respectfully to the minister that he withdraw his bill and come back with legislation that will be more understandable by everyone both in and out of this house.

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) spoke for the Social Credit group I think he suggested that there should be three bills instead of this one. Our idea was that there should be a bill dealing with payments to producers. The passage of that bill could easily be facilitated so that the payments could be sent out quickly. We feel that that is the way the bill should be divided. Then there should be another bill, as the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) has suggested, dealing with the wheat board and the various things that are contained in the rest of this bill. I believe that that would be the best procedure. We are not at all pleased with the suggestion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he is going to bring in one bill dealing with oats and barley and another dealing with the other three parts of this bill. We do not think that will solve anything at all.

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Speaker, may I point out that the principle of the bill is that we amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act. That is the only principle. Any section of the bill can be voted out in committee. I should like to get these payments out to the farmers, and I will accept almost any suggestion to that end. I do not see what we can do at this stage except get second reading of this bill.

Mr. BRACKEN: May I make one suggestion? I think everyone in this house wants to get this money out to the farmers as soon as possible. The minister has put certain sections of the opposition in a difficult position when he asks us to vote on four different principles in one bill, some of which we can accept and some of which we cannot accept. He may do whatever he likes with this now, but I venture to suggest that if he would bring in a measure dealing with the payment out of this money he would get it through in ten minutes. I guarantee he would, so far as this party is concerned.

Mr. HOWE: We might get it through in ten minutes, but I would point out that even if we gave notice today of the resolution, that resolution could not be discussed until some time next week, which would mean that the bill would be discussed later in the week. It would take several days to get the thing through. Then the other place must consider it. There is a procedure for doing what I undertook to do last night, and that is the only procedure known. I said I would stand by that and I am prepared to stand by it. If hon. members insist, there is nothing I can do except to proceed with the bill.

May I point out that the breaking up of bills and bringing in separate bills to amend one act may lead to some rather absurd results. The Minister of Transport is bringing in a bill to amend the shipping act. It will have a great many sections. In all probability second reading will be given to that bill and then hon. members can strike out any clauses that they do not agree with when the bill is in committee. That is exactly the position we are facing here.

The Minister of Justice has an amendment to the criminal code consisting of forty or fifty sections. That is the procedure that is followed there; the bill will be amending one act just as this bill is. My hon. friends know that it is not the practice of this house to discuss a bill twice in the same session. The rules are against it. It is proposed in this instance that we bring in two bills amending the same act in the same session. I have never seen that done since I have been in the house.

Mr. TUCKER: Mr. Speaker, I might just continue what I was going to say because others have dealt with that matter. I would suggest with all deference that we go ahead with this bill. Surely by this time everybody in this parliament knows the facts about wheat, oats and barley. We should let the majority rule in this matter. There should

not be an attempt made by the opposition to see that a bill which a great many believe should be put through is delayed, to adopt a procedure that will in effect kill part of the bill for this year.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. BRACKEN: That is nonsense.

Mr. TUCKER: I say this, and I think I am correct in saying it, that if we send part of this bill to the committee the committee will certainly keep it long enough so that most of the legislatures which will have to act on this matter will be adjourned. The opposition will then have succeeded in preventing this measure from being brought into existence to handle the 1948 crop.

Mr. BRACKEN: That is all nonsense.

Mr. TUCKER: It is not nonsense at all. I ask the leader of the opposition if it is not correct that the legislature of Saskatchewan, which is primarily involved and which must pass complementary legislation, will not be adjourned by Easter?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): They have agreed to call a special session.

Mr. TUCKER: My hon. friends know that if the part of the bill dealing with oats and barley is sent to the committee there would be no chance whatever of getting the bill passed before Easter, in which event the necessary complementary legislation could not be passed by the legislature of Saskatchewan in time to enable the wheat board to handle the 1948 crop. That is the effect of what the opposition is doing, and let there be no mistake about it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. TUCKER: Let there be no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): There is no point of order there.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. TUCKER: I will be called to order by the Speaker and not by my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Then, Mr. Speaker, will you call the hon. member to order, because what he is saying has nothing whatever to do with the point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will admit that I have given much latitude to every member on this point of order.

Mr. FULTON: Nobody else has abused it, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Tucker.]

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been generous to all members and I would ask the hon. gentleman to speak to the point of order.

Mr. TUCKER: The leader of the opposition said that what I was saying was nonsense and I have proved that what I am saying is not nonsense.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It was an understatement.

Mr. TUCKER: That may be my hon. friend's opinion, but everyone is entitled to his opinion. Now I say, and let there be no mistake about it, that the effect of dividing this bill—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. TUCKER: I am in order, Mr. Speaker, surely.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question before the house is a point of order raised on the suggestion made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in putting before the house a motion to divide the bill in two. If the hon. member wishes to discuss that matter I do not see any reason why he should not.

Mr. FULTON: But he is discussing a question of motives.

Mr. TUCKER: I am endeavouring to show what the effect of dividing the bill will be. I am saying that everyone knows, and all members from Saskatchewan will bear me out, that the legislature of that province will adjourn within the next week or ten days, before Easter. In fact, it will prorogue. Now if we divide this bill, what will be the effect? Everyone will admit that in order to bring properly into effect this provision with respect to oats and barley there must be complementary legislation on the part of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): And the premier of Saskatchewan has agreed to call a special session to pass it.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member may know what the premier of Saskatchewan intends to do, but I also heard him say that he intends to have an election when the four years have elapsed and there may be an election right after the house prorogues. What I am saying is this. Let us be reasonable about this matter and look at the facts.

An hon. MEMBER: A swan song.

Mr. TUCKER: It may be my swan song, and other people may sing their swan song in due course. I have known lots of people sing their swan song and they did not even know it.

Let us look at the facts as they are. On the opposite side there are members representing in numbers the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. When they are arguing that the bill be divided I would suggest to them that they are in effect voting to create a situation whereby there will be no chance to have it apply to oats and barley until at least the crop year of 1949. If they support that viewpoint—

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Is this a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): On a point of order—

Mr. TUCKER: If they support that viewpoint, that is their concern.

Mr. COLDWELL: You know we do not.

Mr. TUCKER: Then why did your speakers support it?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is taking a little too much latitude.

Mr. TUCKER: Mr. Speaker, last night—

An hon. MEMBER: He is too windy.

Mr. TUCKER: That may be your opinion, but I am entitled to speak for the people who sent me here, and I intend to do so. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that a certain line of conduct has been suggested by the official opposition. It has been upheld by the C.C.F. party and by the Social Credit party.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, is the member discussing a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is out of order. Every member is anxious to proceed with the legislation. It has been suggested by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the second reading of the bill be passed and that afterwards a motion be put to authorize the committee to divide the bill in two. That is the question before the house.

Mr. TUCKER: I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, and I claim the right to answer the arguments made by the opposition party last night.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, are we on the bill or on a question of procedure?

Mr. TUCKER: I have not spoken for forty minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. member that what is before the house is a point of order. If he wishes to speak on

the merits of the bill he will have an opportunity to do so, but at the moment there is a point of order before the house.

Mr. BENTLEY: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is so fine that I do not know whether I shall be in order in what I am about to say. I will try to stick to the point, and if I get off the point you will call me to order. I am not greatly impressed with the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat, neither am I impressed with some of the other things I see going on.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member is speaking for the third time. I have not been permitted to speak once yet.

Mr. KNOWLES: This is the first time he has been on his feet on this point of order.

Mr. BENTLEY: The point of order is, I believe, on the procedure for dividing this bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question before the house is a point of order. If the hon. member wishes to speak on the point of order he may say what he has to say.

Mr. COLDWELL: He does wish to speak on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: He should not, however, discuss the merits of the bill. In the debate on the second reading of the bill he will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BENTLEY: I am trying, Mr. Speaker, to speak on the point of order, which, as your Honour has said, has reference to the procedure on the bill. I am speaking to that point. I am anxious to see everything in this bill—

Mr. SPEAKER: The question before the house is quite simple. We have before us the second reading of Bill No. 135, entitled an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1935. The Minister of Trade and Commerce rose and suggested to the house that there be second reading of the bill and that afterwards he would move a motion to direct the committee of the whole to divide the bill in two. That is the question. I think the house should now arrive at a conclusion. Either it will accept the minister's proposal or it will not.

Mr. BENTLEY: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HOWE: May I speak to the point of order?

Mr. BENTLEY: I have not finished speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I sug

gest that in view of what has happened here this afternoon the minister should not divide the bill but should go ahead with the whole thing.

Mr. HOWE: I am in the hands of the committee. I have stated my intention, provided that it meets the approval of the house. I suggest that we proceed with second reading and, as we reach the various stages, I am willing to make the motions I have indicated.

Mr. GARDINER: In view of the undertaking given last night, may I say one thing. The rule states:

The committee of the whole may, in conformity with instructions, consolidate two bills into one or divide one bill into two or more.

Before the committee can do that it must have instructions from the house giving it the authority to do it. Giving it the authority to do it does not mean that the committee must do it. That whole question has to be discussed in committee; but coming back to the question as to what we are doing on the second reading, may I say we are amending the Canadian Wheat Board Act. We are amending it with three or four sections which provide for three different things.

I think all hon. members will agree that in bills of this kind it has always been within the authority of the committee to oppose sections in the bill, and it is within the power of the committee of the whole, when this bill goes to that committee, to divide this particular bill about which we are talking, even though the house itself may have voted for the second reading. That can be done, but what the minister has suggested is this. If at that stage it is the will of the committee of the whole that it should be done, instead of voting for that section at all, the committee would be prepared to send it to a committee on agriculture that committee would decide whether it is going to vote on it, and may determine to report against its being in the bill. That authority for the committee of the whole to take the procedure outlined must, according to the rules, be given by the house when the bill is referred to committee. The minister has simply said that he is prepared to make the necessary movements to make that possible, and the first thing that has to be done in order to get into committee at all is to pass the second reading. When we have passed second reading then he will ask this house to give authority to the committee to divide the bill if it desires to do so, and if it does not desire to do so, it can make the decision then just as well as it can make it now.

[Mr. Bentley.]

Mr. FULTON: On that point, does there not have to be a motion now while the house—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. QUELCH: I think the suggestion of the Minister of Agriculture is a good one. On the other hand, is there not the other alternative? I understand that the bill on veterans affairs has been sent to the committee on veterans affairs, and that committee will report back to the house part of the bill, leaving the rest of the bill for discussion. Could we not have this bill sent in its entirety to the committee on agriculture, and then just report back the section relating to the payment of the increases?

Mr. GARDINER: We would not get the payments through for two or three weeks, and they should be out before that.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think the point made by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Bentley) should be considered by the minister. What we suggested last night was done in order to facilitate payment to the farmers. If we are to mix that up with a discussion of the amendment dealing with the manner in which oats and barley are sold and these payments are delayed, then I think the best thing to do is for the minister to go ahead as originally suggested and we will vote on the principle of the bill.

Mr. HOWE: The minister's position is quite clear, Mr. Speaker. He will follow the procedure outlined and at each stage he will offer these motions. The committee can pass them or can defeat them.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): I wish to make a few observations on the measure now that we are through with procedure. I am one of those who believe that we have either to go through now and discuss the bill at this stage or to agree to the whole principle of the bill. I realize the difficulties there have been today with the procedure. The minister gave all sorts of undertakings last night that he would divide the bill in two. When we come to that stage we shall be called upon to pass second reading of the bill, and if we all agree to it we agree to everything in principle, which I cannot do myself at this stage. Nobody in this House of Commons is more anxious than I am to facilitate the payment to the farmers. That is what I had in mind on the resolution stage—

Mr. GARDINER: On a point of order, the position taken by the members of the government is not in accordance with what has just been said. The Minister of Trade and

Commerce has said that the government does not, or the introducer of the bill does not, consider that members in the official opposition or in any other part of the house are voting on this particular section when they vote on the principle of the bill. That was definitely understood in the procedure that was outlined, and there is a possibility of doing that. No one will be charged with that position at all. That section can be voted out. I hear someone whispering, "What about the rules?" I just read the rules. The rules give this house the authority to instruct the committee, and the minister has said that he will move to instruct the committee that it has authority to divide the bill. I do not know anything could be any clearer than that. When hon. members are voting on the principle, no one is voting for that. The bill may be divided and, if so, the feed grains may be considered separately.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss this bill at this time and, irrespective of what any minister may have said, we are bound by the rules of the house. That is why we are in this dilemma this afternoon. I am very sorry about that, but I want to make a few observations today and I want to repeat that I and all members of this party are just as anxious as anybody else in the house to facilitate the immediate payment of the farmers' money that is now held by the wheat board for these crop years. We are anxious to have those payments made. As I followed the statement of instructions from the Minister of Trade and Commerce, immediately you call second reading this afternoon, and as I have read the bill, the bill will be divided in two in committee, and the matter of the pension and contributions will be linked with Bill No. 135 which has to do with payment to the farmers. It is on that point I want to make some observations. It is true that the bill dealing with oats and barley may be referred to the standing committee on agriculture and colonization. I know some people doubt whether I truly represent the farm constituency that I have the honour to represent, but, apart from two or three years overseas at one time, I have farmed all my life and I think I know something about the desires and wishes of the people whom I represent.

As to this matter of pensions, this is a government monopolistic board at this time. The officials of the wheat board are appointed by the government. The producers have no option at this time but to deliver their wheat to this board. There are some 676 full-time employees and twenty-eight part-time employees. My colleague, the hon. member for

Portage la Prairie (Mr. Miller) was able to obtain that information for us. I just wish to quote a short list of the employees to whom the producers will be called upon to contribute. Of those 676 employees, those receiving under \$1,000 a year number 103; \$1,000 to \$2,000, 388; \$2,000 to \$3,000, 122; \$3,000 to \$4,000, 26; \$4,000 to \$5,000, 6; \$5,000 to \$6,000, 7; \$6,000 to \$7,000, 2; \$7,000 to \$8,000, 8; \$8,000 to \$9,000, 2; \$9,000 to \$10,000, one; \$10,000 to \$15,000, 11; over \$15,000 one. That will give the house some idea what these officials are receiving today. According to the minister who introduced this measure, pensions will be paid on a contributory basis, fifty-fifty, which means that the board contributing the 50 per cent will charge that amount to the producers of any and all grain which they are handling at that time, and that is a principle to which I take strong objection. I say if this is a government board, one of the only boards with an entire monopoly that we have operating in Canada today, with government appointees, I want to make it clear on this one point that we are not objecting to pensions as such. I am a strong believer in pensions. But as regards a board such as this, appointed by the government, if they are to pay pensions on a fifty-fifty contributory basis, the board's 50 per cent contribution should be taken out of the consolidated revenue fund of this nation. That is my point there.

If we voted on this measure at this time we would be agreeing to the principle of the bill which says that the board shall pay the 50 per cent contribution, and if the undertaking is carried out to divide the bill that would be part of the basis of payment, unless eliminated at this time. We are anxious to see the farmers get the payments as quickly as possible.

With respect to payments, I want to say something with regard to wheat also. The Canadian wheat board handled 335,108,000 bushels of wheat in the 1946 crop year. Last year the then Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) and the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) said there was a difference of seventy-seven cents on that crop as received by the farmer to date. True enough we shall have to take into account the further payments that will be made now and in the future; and whatever those are, they will reduce that difference. Anybody can multiply that by the amount of grain handled and he will know the loss the farmers have taken there to date.

Just prior to the announcement of the United Kingdom wheat agreement in the summer of

1946, I received from many farm organizations in my riding resolutions asking that there be an initial payment at that time of \$1.80 a bushel for the 1945, 1946 and 1947 crops. They went farther than that, because at that time the payment had not been made on the participation certificates for 1943 and 1944, and they wanted payments made at that figure on those years as well. Many of those farmers who sent in those resolutions at that time were members of the Manitoba pool. It was estimated by the minister that the board would handle some 270 million bushels of the 1947 wheat crop. I want to say that at September 2, 1947, just about the time when harvesting becomes general on the prairies, class 2 wheat was quoted at \$2.78 a bushel. On October 1, or practically a month later, it was quoted at \$3.17 a bushel. Some time later on in the year, and at the first of this year, it was as high as \$3.42. The Canadian farmer was receiving, on the average, for No. 2 northern wheat at the elevator, \$1.17 a bushel. That is what he has received to date on the 1947 crop. Then, if I understand the situation rightly, all available class 2 wheat of the 1947 crop had been contracted for by January of this year. I understood the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) to say that, and that the estimated surplus for the year's business would be some \$80,000,000. If you take into account the difference between the world price and the actual price received on the 1947 crop, you will have some idea of the loss there will be there.

On October 1, 1947, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) announced that under the United Kingdom-Canada wheat agreement Britain would pay \$2 a bushel, basis Fort William, for the 1948 crop, effective August 1, 1948. On the date of this announcement class 2 Canadian wheat was quoted at \$3.17 a bushel. When the original contract was announced in 1946 at \$1.55 a bushel, basis Fort William, class 2 Canadian wheat was quoted at \$2.05 a bushel. That is a great contrast. According to the debate, in the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, there should be somewhere around \$234 million of the farmers' money in the wheat board's hands for the years 1945, 1946 and 1947 for disbursement. On approximately 842 million bushels handled in those years, that would mean approximately twenty-seven cents a bushel if it were all paid out on that wheat. If, as the Minister of Agriculture has suggested, twenty cents will be paid out in the near future, that would bring the payment received by the farmers net to about \$1.35 a bushel when that payment is made. If the crop yield for 1948 and 1949 is the same average yield as it has been for the past three years, and if all of these next two

[Mr. Ross (Souris).]

crops for 1948 and 1949—including the contract to Britain, domestic consumption in Canada and other wheat disposed of—is sold for \$2 a bushel—\$2 for it all in the next two years—then there might be approximately another eighteen cents for disbursements on a total of 1,402 million bushels of wheat handled by the board over those five years, which would net the farmer an approximate average for those five years of \$1.53 a bushel. I am going to repeat that on those figures before us—some of which are only estimates while others are actual figures—the greatest gamble in wheat in Canadian history was negotiated by the Minister of Agriculture during 1946, through the Department of Trade and Commerce of this government. This gamble will cost the Canadian wheat farmers many hundreds of millions of dollars that will never be regained by those producers. I feel sure of that at this time. The Minister of Agriculture stated in his argument earlier in this discussion of the resolution, as reported at page 1717 of *Hansard*:

I am surprised to hear hon. members who represent agriculture constituencies, and who should know the views of their own people, talking in the manner in which they have talked.

I presume that was meant partly for me, Mr. Speaker. In the same debate he puts some figures on *Hansard*. He was talking about the 1945 crop. He said, and I think his figures were correct, that the Canadian average was \$1.15 a bushel and the United States average was \$1.50 a bushel for 1945. For 1946—

Mr. GARDINER: That is not what I put on the record. I put on the record the advance for the 1945 crop was \$1.15 to the average farmer, not the price, as compared with the United States price.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is exactly what I meant. I said probably the amount of money already received by the Canadian farmers, and I have been making comparisons. My argument has been that there was still more money to pay. I am not going to quibble about the odd word.

Mr. GARDINER: Anyone who reads *Hansard* will not be misled.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is the initial payment.

Mr. GARDINER: The average initial payment in 1945 was \$1.15.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): That is right.

Mr. GARDINER: We propose under this legislation to pay out more on the same wheat.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I know. I have already estimated another twenty cents at this time.

If that went on and in 1948 and 1949 there were average crops which were sold at \$2 a bushel, there would be another eighteen cents to pay, certainly not over twenty cents on the total; and the farmer would receive \$1.50 and some cents for this year. That should be quite accurate.

Mr. GARDINER: No.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): What is wrong?

Mr. GARDINER: It should be much higher than that.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I would hope that it would be, but I do not know what sort of mysterious operator we have in charge of this system. In view of the remarks about those who represent farm ridings, in discussing this matter—and the only opportunity we had to discuss that wheat bill with Britain was under trade and commerce estimates during 1946—at page 4832 of *Hansard* of August 15, 1946, I said:

I have received several resolutions from farm gatherings in my own constituency. May I quote one of them? It is not an official farm organization, but it is a large gathering of farmers in the east end of my riding. I wish to read the portion which has a bearing on this subject:

"We also consider that the 12½ per cent raise in farm implement prices, which with increase of fuel and other costs to farmers is of serious national and even international concern. For fifteen years the agriculturists of the west have, through no fault of their own, seen their equipment deteriorating with replacements difficult to make, and now, at a time when such great appeals are being made to produce more food, the government allows rising production costs with no comparable income increases and no adequate assurance of any. The farmer has never refused to produce at a cost plus 5 per cent basis nor has he gone on strike. Therefore we feel justified in strongly urging the government to either insist on lower production costs to farmers through price control or else to bring produce prices up to at least the level of the United States farmer's returns.

"We also believe that outstanding wheat participation certificates should be settled for on the basis of \$1.80 per bushel."

That was before the announcement was made as to the price which will be paid for the 1943 certificates.

"If Canada wishes to sell wheat at a price below that obtained by competitors, then all Canada should meet the difference in price, not force the farmer to make the donation.

"And further that copies of this statement be mailed to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture and the member for Souris . . ."

I think I was representing those people and spoke for the vast majority of the people in the part of the province that I have the honour to represent. I also put on a quotation from a number of briefs at that time,

and I will not quote all of them. But they pointed out, as may be found at page 4833 of *Hansard*:

It is a sellers' market and, as such, offers a great chance to rebuild our wheat trade on a broad and highly diversified base. Something much better than the pre-war diversity of markets might be achieved in the reconstruction period under freer conditions of trade and with a vigorous selling policy.

That has proved to be very true. Later on I said, at page 4833:

I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether anything is proposed for the purpose of holding down the export price of manufactured goods, lumber and other materials, as was done throughout the war years for the farm producer in the matter of wheat. I am sure that many farmers are misled. The pool officials themselves have been. When they said they wanted a contract of this type over some years they understood that the same deal would apply to the principal manufactured goods which the farmer finds it necessary to procure in this country. But that is not the case, because these other prices are rising daily in Canada . . .

They certainly have risen since those days. According to a pamphlet put out by the Bank of Canada, prices of farm implements have increased by some 27½ per cent, some types of tractor fuel by 50 per cent, binder twine by 126 per cent and building materials by 103 per cent. So the very situation we pointed to at that time, the first and only opportunity we had of discussing that agreement, came about. We were the only party in this House of Commons to oppose strenuously that contract and the price set then. We gave our reasons for our opposition; and what we predicted has come true beyond our expectations, I am very sorry to say.

I do not wish to take up more of the time of the committee right now. I wish the government had seen fit to divide this measure as I suggested on behalf of this party in the early stages. If that had been done the provision for payment of the farmers' own money now held by the wheat board could have been put through, and the government could have gone ahead and issued the cheques as soon as they wished.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern): I have not spoken previously on this matter, and I feel that I should say something about it before it goes through. I shall try to be as concise as possible in dealing with the various points covered by the bill. First it makes provision for pensions for officers and employees of the wheat board, half the cost to be paid out of the receipts of the board and the other half to be contributed by those employees and officers. Of course it is

in time that we can have the provinces pass the necessary complementary legislation and have it applied to oats and barley in 1948.

I ask for the support of those representing the prairies. I ask that they oppose this idea of dividing this bill, as a result of which it would not come into force and apply to this year's crop. I ask for majority rule in this parliament, and I suggest that this bill be put through because a majority in this House of Commons wants it, and that it be put through at this session of parliament so that it will be effective at this session.

Mr. KNOWLES: Let us do it right now.

Mr. TUCKER: Oh, I know you would like to do a lot of speaking so that nobody else could say anything. I know that. I have seen that game before, on your part.

Mr. WRIGHT: You would rather talk.

Mr. TUCKER: If I may proceed—

Mr. BURTON: Why did you not ask for it two months ago?

Mr. TUCKER: I did. If you had listened to my broadcast report to the people of Saskatchewan—

Mr. BURTON: Now we are getting it.

Mr. TUCKER: —you would have heard me saying that I had asked the government last October to pass the necessary legislation to get these payments out not later than the 15th of this month. And I venture to say I asked the government for this legislation long before the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Burton) ever thought of it. Indeed it is probably after he heard my speech that he thought of it.

In regard to the attitude toward the money being dealt with in this bill, may I say I wish to express my support of the stand taken by the minister, that as soon as it was clear that any of the money could be paid out from time to time, it should be paid out; and after all, this is the farmers' money. There should be no thought that, when a bill like this is put through, the money is being taken out of the consolidated revenue fund. The money belongs to the farmers, and the government should be in a position to pay it out as it becomes available, and as it is made safe to do so.

Some question has been raised as to whether the people really approve this legislation, which means that oats and barley will be brought under the wheat board and handled by the wheat board on a compulsory basis. I wish to deal with that for a moment. First of all I would refer to the position taken by [Mr. Tucker.]

the Canadian Federation of Agriculture which I think, is admittedly a responsible organization and one which represents all farmers in Canada.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Why do you say that?

Mr. TUCKER: I say that because I believe it. That is a good enough reason for me to say anything—because I believe it.

They made a submission to the government on February 26, some sentences of which I should like to read. They said:

Certain fundamental principles of federation policy stand out, apply equally as well now as at any former time, and have guided us in respect to present-day policies, and to recommendations we are making herewith.

The federation has repeatedly advocated market and price stabilization measures of varying types and varying degrees.

In line with this policy we are urging:

(a) International commodity agreements.

I wish to commend the government for doing all it can to bring about international agreements in connection with wheat. I believe that that will assure the producers of the world, those who produce the basic food—wheat—a reasonable return for their labour. It will also mean that there will be less scarcity at one time with people going hungry and when the farmers have little to sell, and will avoid over-supplies of food at other times when the farmers would have to sell at low prices. It continues:

(b) Stabilization of feed prices, and the placing of the marketing of coarse grains under the Canadian wheat board (one member body dissenting).

Only one body dissented from that submission.

(c) Continuance of the freight assistance policy—

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Who was that? I know more than one.

Mr. TUCKER:

—of feeds until such time as it may be embodied in a national feed grain policy.

(d) Floor prices for agricultural products.

(e) Having many marketing schemes operating successfully under provincial legislation, we again emphasize our desire and need for federal marketing legislation.

I endorse that entirely; and I ask the government—and I am sure they will do so—to pay close attention to these considered representations of the farmers of this country, not only the farmers of western Canada, but farmers from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia. This is the most representative

organization, so far as the farming industry is concerned, that has ever been organized in this country. The brief goes on:

In representations to the government the Canadian Federation of Agriculture has always advocated moderate prices, and have never asked for "all that the traffic would bear." Canadian farmers have consistently supported stabilized prices fair alike to producers and consumers of our farm products.

It is a great tribute to the far-sightedness and statesmanship of the farmers of this country that they have not sought to get the last nickel they could as a result of the extremities of the starving peoples of the world. Rather, they have said, "We would rather have a fair price now, with the hope of some stability running along through the years."

Mr. LOW: Where is the stability?

Mr. TUCKER: We have stability, I hope, in regard to wheat.

An hon. MEMBER: You hope.

Mr. TUCKER: All you can have about anything in this present day and age, in these difficult times, is a confident hope based upon reasonable policies. I submit that when thirty-six nations of the world get together to sign a pact in regard to the basic price of wheat, a pact which will give some security to the wheat producer, and some guarantee to the consumer that in days of scarcity he will not be charged a price which he cannot pay, it should ensure that the producer will not be faced with a recurrence of the situation we had in 1932 when people had to sell No. 1 northern wheat, beautiful wheat, for nineteen cents a bushel, less than what it cost alone to harvest and thresh; we hope that with this pact those conditions will never occur again. To see to it that they do not occur again, we must not listen to the suggestion that we should try to grab the last nickel we can today. If we take the last nickel we can today the time may come again, as it came following the first war, when the price will go down far below the cost of production.

I shall go on and read further from this submission:

As we have indicated, our dairymen, poultrymen, and livestock feeders are keenly concerned over the rise and fluctuations in the cost of feeds since decontrol, and are urging measures to stabilize these costs.

Our main recommendation in this respect is contained in a resolution passed by our annual convention, which urges once more that the Canadian wheat board become the sole marketing agency for all other grains in addition to wheat. (One member body has recorded its dissent.)

In regard to what the farmers really want I would much rather take the opinion of these

elected and trusted leaders of farmers from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia than I would the opinion of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith), the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) or any other person who speaks as they have been speaking in this house. The presentation continues:

This resolution asks that the necessary amendments to the wheat board act do not disregard the principle that the wheat board be an agency operating primarily for the benefit of, and in the interests of grain producers; it asks that the purpose of the legislation be to enable the board to stabilize grain prices and prevent short-term fluctuations; and that it be provided always that the board's domestic operating and selling policy shall carry out the spirit and intent of a general agricultural policy that shall effect a proper relationship between grain and livestock prices, as determined by the federal Department of Agriculture after consultation with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

There is the basic idea of the farmers of Canada. They want stabilized prices at reasonable levels. From the time a man puts the seed in the ground, farming is a tremendously risky business. Wind, frost, drought, pests, hail—all these things are items we expect governments to help us try to overcome. Pests, insurance against—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. TUCKER: I was not thinking of the C.C.F. when I mentioned pests, although they seemed to be rather self-conscious. I say that there is an attempt made by all reasonably honest people to try to eliminate pests and also to ensure against things that cannot be eliminated, such as hail and drought. Just as there is that struggle to eliminate some of the risks connected with farming in regard to the production of the product, so the farmer has said that he wants to be protected as much as possible against the ups and downs of demand and supply in regard to the price of his product.

He knows that the consumer is always willing to pay a fair price for his product, that the consumer would rather pay a fair price than have it go so low that the time would come when production would fall off and the consumer could not buy it at all. So he realized that any long-run policy which gave a certain measure of stability to the price of food products was in the interests, not only of the producer but of the consumer.

Mr. ARGUE: Do you believe in price control?

Mr. TUCKER: No, if you do not control some other matters at the same time. Furthermore, I do not believe in the attempt to control prices by government edict.

Mr. ARGUE: Prices of farm machinery are going up every day.

Mr. TUCKER: That is another matter. I have only forty minutes in which to speak and I shall be ready to deal with that at another time. I say that what the farmers are asking here is that there be some measure of stability in regard to the things they have to sell. It is not a matter of prices being fixed by the government, it is a matter of saying that there shall be some floor lasting for some considerable time under prices, and then, in return for that, that there shall be some sort of ceiling. If the consumer is willing to pay a minimum price that is a fair price, then in days of scarcity he will not be asked to pay an exorbitant price at his end.

The suggestion has been made that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture is not representative of the farmers. I intend to answer that charge in this way. There is in Saskatchewan a gathering every year called the Saskatchewan association of rural municipalities. That gathering is representative of all rural municipalities in the province. The people gathered there were of all political parties. This matter was brought up at a recent meeting of that association. I cannot summarize better what they said about agricultural policy than to read an editorial which appeared in the *Star-Phoenix* of March 2, 1948. This reads:

Delegates to the municipal convention debated farm marketing policies. A persistent campaign has been directed from Winnipeg to convince the Saskatchewan farmer that he should demand "the world price" for his grain. Not many who argue for "the world price" attempt to define which price they consider is "the world price." The inference always is that it is higher than the price the Saskatchewan farmer is receiving. A resolution urging the convention to ask for "the world price" and that the federal government subsidize wheat sales in the domestic and United Kingdom markets to bring growers' returns up to "the world price" was tabled after some delegates had asked for a definition of "world price." The resolution was brought out at a later session and amended to ask "parity price" for wheat. This resolution was approved. Debate on the resolution indicated that a large number of delegates were more interested in stable prices than in exacting momentary famine prices.

I commend that to the hon. member for Souris.

Some of the delegates reminded the convention that if the farmer demanded top prices now he could scarcely ask for protection against possible depressed prices in the future. A resolution opposing the wheat agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom was rejected without debate. One other resolution fits into the general pattern of farm thinking about

[Mr. Tucker.]

grain. It called for the closing of the Winnipeg grain exchange and the sale of coarse grains through the wheat board. All this adds up to an acceptance in Saskatchewan of the federal government's wheat policy. The delegates sheered off from any suggestion to destroy the marketing structure built up since the end of the war.

I suggest that there is a most convincing demonstration of the attitude of the western farmer toward the United Kingdom-Canada wheat agreement, toward the wheat board, toward closing the grain exchange, and toward this bill bringing oats and barley under the control of the wheat board. There were the elected leaders of the farmers; there were the representatives of the municipalities of Saskatchewan, Liberals, Progressive Conservatives, C.C.F.'ers, members of all political parties; that is what they decided almost unanimously. This indicates that the farmers of the west approve the stabilization policy of the present government. Those who attacked it by telling them that they were losing money did not get the approval of that convention. They realized that the first step toward 35-cent wheat was at the time to demand \$3 for their wheat.

I wish to pay tribute to the far-sightedness of the farmers of the west. They are not listening to the propaganda put out from Winnipeg. They are thinking of past history and realizing that if they now ask for the world price the time will come when it will be too low for them to get along on it. They want stability and they appreciate what this government has done in giving them stabilized prices at a reasonable level. They approve the Agricultural Prices Support Act, and I for one hope that will be made a permanent policy of the government of the country. Just as the working man is entitled to fair minimum wages and to a guarantee of a fair standard of living while he gives his labour to the country, so the farmer who produces the food of the country and of the world is entitled to be guaranteed a fair minimum return for his work, so that he can keep his family and his dependents in a reasonable measure of comfort and educate his children and provide them with medical attention and all the other amenities of life.

I hope that every member will support the concrete steps to bring about protection and basic security for the farmers. What has been the foundation of every nation?—the sturdy farmers of the land. Our farmers stood by us in the days of war when they did not ask for the last nickel for their products. They stood for control of prices and they made stupendous efforts to feed us and our allies.

They stand by us in these days of famine in the world when again they say, "We do not want the last nickel".

They are saying to their leaders today, "Let us not be led away by asking for the last nickel. Let us realize that if we are to have a stable price we must not ask for the highest price possible in days when prices are rising if we do not wish to take the lowest price when prices are falling".

Therefore I commend the government for the way in which it is going steadily forward with a program for the purpose of bringing stability to the farming people of the country, the way in which it is going ahead step by step toward the goal of making the farmers' position more secure.

Let me say this in conclusion to those who declare that this is an attack on personal liberty. The only way in which the compulsory part of the oats and barley section of the bill can operate and stay in operation is if the provincial governments concerned, particularly the prairie provinces, are willing to give that board necessary powers. The farmers have asked almost unanimously that these powers be given. Is this not a democratic parliament where the will of the people should prevail? It should not be thwarted by a small and determined group, and I say that if it turns out that all the grim forebodings of the Progressive Conservative party prove to be in some measure correct, that, because the farmers ask to have oats and barley handled by a government marketing board, therefore all liberty is gone, then there is nothing to prevent them from taking action through their provincial legislatures to provide the necessary compulsion. Remember it is the provincial legislatures that will provide the necessary compulsion in this matter. This is only enabling legislation, and at any time that the farmers feel their rights are being interfered with they can withdraw the support they are giving through this complementary provincial legislation.

I say that the farmers of the country expect that their wishes in this matter, in the handling of their products, shall be recognized by this parliament. I ask the government to go ahead and take the sentiment of the house on the whole bill. Let us see who the people are who are against the will of the farmers being carried out with reference to this question of oats and barley. Do not let them try to bury it. I ask the government to go ahead with the bill and take the sentiment of the house upon it.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): I do not wish to deal immediately with the remarks of the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker). First I wish to compliment the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) on his very fine speech yesterday. I do not know when I have heard so much nonsense talked so eloquently in the same length of time. First he set out to tell us about his close connection with agriculture. His maternal grandfather was married to a farmer who lived north of Regina, and on the basis of that close connection with agriculture he proceeded to tell us that the farmers of Canada were opposed to having oats and barley and coarse grains under a compulsory wheat board. He made little of the directorate of our wheat board and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. He said they were professional advocates who did not know the will of the farmer. He knows. His maternal grandmother was a farmer's wife; he is a lawyer, and he knows much better what the will of the farmers in this matter is and what the farmers want with regard to this measure.

As far as I am concerned and, I believe, as far as the members of the house are concerned, I think it would be much better for us to follow the resolutions and suggestions made to this parliament by agricultural organizations right across Canada.

Our Canadian Federation of Agriculture have for at least the last two years advocated that all grains should be placed under the wheat board act and handled in that manner. It is the first time we have had agreement between eastern and western agriculture on this matter. We find that the farmers of the east, having met in the Canadian Federation of Agriculture with farmers from western Canada, and having there sat down and discussed the various problems in the marketing of grain, have come to a unanimous decision, and that unanimous decision is recorded in the resolutions of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

I think, therefore, the least that this parliament could do, the least that we as members could do, would be to implement this legislation as far as oats and barley are concerned. We have in western Canada three different provincial governments. The hon. member for Rosthern has stated that the referring of this bill to the committee on agriculture would be likely to defeat the purpose of the bill being implemented in 1948.

I am doubtful, from the actions of this government, whether they ever intended this bill to go into effect in 1948. If they had, they would have acted differently. They would

have brought it in earlier, in the first place; and in the second place they would have had some consultations with the provincial governments with respect to complementary legislation, because that is an important point. It is indicated by various telegrams and letters which I have, and which I will read, that it is necessary that the legislation be approximately the same for the three provinces.

If the government were as anxious as the hon. member for Rosthern has suggested to have this legislation passed they would have called in these people before this and suggested to them some method whereby the complementary legislation could be passed in the provinces. That was one of the reasons why we were suggesting that the bill should be divided and go to the committee on agriculture. The intention was not to hold it up. It was simply so that the various governments could come here and there could be some consultation, some agreement reached as to the necessary legislation which should be passed by the provincial governments.

As far as the government of Saskatchewan is concerned, I have a telegram sent by the premier of that province to the Right Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, on March 1. It states:

Press reports you as stating that complementary legislation must be passed by provinces to enable wheat board to handle coarse grains. Saskatchewan government anxious that wheat board have this power as soon as possible and therefore regrets that we have not been approached with a view to having complementary legislation passed. Will you forward to us as quickly as possible draft of complementary approved legislation which in opinion of Department of Justice would give to wheat board necessary powers to handle coarse grains. Haste essential if this legislation to be dealt with by legislature during present session.

In reply to that, the Minister of Trade and Commerce wired the Premier of Saskatchewan to this effect:

Thanks for your wire March first re complementary legislation to enable wheat board to handle coarse grains. I am asking Minister of Justice to communicate with you. You will appreciate that federal legislation is still at resolution stage with indications of strong opposition which may delay enactment.

Immediately on receipt of that wire, the Premier of Saskatchewan wired the Minister of Justice to this effect:

Would appreciate reply to my wire March second re complementary legislation to enable wheat board to handle coarse grains. Inconceivable that resolution before parliament unless bill prepared. Would appreciate draft of legislation which in opinion of your department would enable wheat board to handle

[Mr. Wright.]

coarse grains. If you prefer it will have one of our law officers fly to Ottawa to discuss drafting necessary legislation. Please advise.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce wrote a letter to the Premier of Saskatchewan outlining in some measure the necessary steps. In reply to the premier's wire of March 1, he said this:

Dear Premier Douglas: Ottawa, March 4, 1948

I have referred to the Department of Justice your recent request for a draft of approved legislation for the control of the marketing of oats and barley within Saskatchewan, to be complementary to the proposed amendments to the Canadian Wheat Board Act. I am informed that the control of the marketing of oats and barley within a province can be established under provincial legislation by several different methods, and that the necessary provincial statute can take one of several forms, depending on the scheme of control to be employed. As you know, it is contemplated that complementary legislation for this purpose should be passed not only in Saskatchewan but in other provinces, and it is felt that the controls to be established by the provinces should be uniform in form and effect in each province, and that such provinces should mutually agree to the duration and form of the provincial legislation.

I feel that it is the responsibility of the provinces, rather than the dominion, to select the form and to determine the duration of the legislation and the form of the controls to be established in relation to the marketing of oats and barley within each province. Until the provinces have agreed to a uniform scheme of control and have determined the duration of that scheme, it does not seem advisable for consideration to be given to the drafting of a statute for any one province. When such agreement has been reached, I feel that a uniform statute can be prepared by the legal advisers to the provinces.

I have discussed the subject of complementary legislation with Mr. R. H. Milliken, K.C., of Regina, solicitor for the Saskatchewan wheat pool, who seems to be thoroughly familiar with the problems involved.

On March 8 Premier Douglas replied to this effect:

Dear Mr. Howe:

Thank you for your letter of March 4 regarding the drafting of complementary legislation for the purpose of giving the wheat board power to handle coarse grains. As I stated in my wire, the Saskatchewan government is most anxious to pass the necessary legislation for this purpose, and would like to have this done during the present session. I note you suggest that the provinces should agree to a uniform scheme of control and draft legislation accordingly.

It would seem to me that if the federal government is really desirous of having this complementary legislation passed, they would either prepare draft legislation and submit it to the provinces concerned and ask them to pass it as quickly as possible, or they would take the initiative in calling those provinces together to confer with the Department of Justice in order

that legislation could be drafted. I would therefore urge that you let us have a draft proposal as quickly as possible or that you urge the Department of Justice to invite the provinces to send representatives to Ottawa with a view to drafting uniform legislation at the earliest possible date.

The Saskatchewan government is prepared to have one of its law officers in Ottawa on 48 hours' notice if you will advise us of such a meeting. Otherwise, we would appreciate having a draft bill for consideration at the present session of the legislature.

It is quite evident that if this government is as anxious as the hon. member for Rosthern has indicated to have this legislation passed in 1948 and put into effect, then it should have done something more than what has been done to date with regard to having complementary legislation passed.

Mr. HOWE: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes.

Mr. HOWE: If the government of Saskatchewan wished to pass the buck on a contentious type of legislation the logical thing to do would be to ask the federal government to draft the bill, would it not?

Mr. WRIGHT: Saskatchewan is not trying to pass the buck to anybody. All that government are trying to do is to get this measure into effect, and they are prepared to co-operate. They are not the type of government that is all the time passing the buck. They are prepared to take responsibility when the responsibility is theirs. They have never given any indication that they wanted to pass the buck.

Mr. GARDINER: How could the Saskatchewan government, or anyone else, draft legislation which is complementary to legislation that has not yet passed this house?

Mr. WRIGHT: The answer to that question is simply this. The minister had a draft bill which he was fairly sure would pass the house. That certainly is no excuse.

Mr. HOWE: It did not look like that last night.

Mr. WRIGHT: He intends to put it through, and it is very likely to go through parliament. If the bill had been amended in parliament, certainly the complementary legislation could have been amended much more easily than entirely new legislation having to be drafted.

Mr. GARDINER: Based on the procedure so far, it would not get through in time for their present session.

Mr. POULIOT: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. WRIGHT: No; it is six o'clock. At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

On the order:

House in committee on Bill No. 48 (Letter J of the Senate), intitled: "An act to incorporate National General Insurance Company" (without amendment).—Mr. Benidickson.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would call to the attention of the house standing order 110, Beaudesne, second edition, page 276, entitled "Bills reported together", which reads as follows:

All private bills reported to the house by any committee may, on one motion be referred together to a committee of the whole house and such committee may consider and report one or more such bills at the same sitting.

So. Mr. Benidickson moves, seconded by Mr. McIvor, that I do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider Bills Nos. 48, 49, 59 and 115. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. REID: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, does your ruling mean that if a member opposes one bill, the four would move into committee at one time? Or does it mean that if a member was against a certain bill, the four are opposed?

Mr. KNOWLES: This is not a second reading.

Mr. REID: I know that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The bills will be taken one after the other in the committee. But instead of referring the bills one after the other to the committee, to report one after the other to the Chair, they may be referred to the committee all together. That has been the practice in the past and it is in accordance with rule 110. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. CHURCH: I want to have explained this bill about this insurance company.

Mr. COLDWELL: Do I understand that the bills which Your Honour proposes to refer to the committee are bills that have already been considered by a committee?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. COLDWELL: The bills had second reading some time ago?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, and after second reading they were referred to the standing committee on banking and commerce and have been reported. Instead of having one motion for each bill, they are referred all together to the committee of the whole. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY

The house in committee on Bill No. 48, to incorporate National General Insurance Company—Mr. Benidickson—Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Incorporation.

Mr. CHURCH: I should like to ask, Mr. Chairman, what the law of Canada is regarding these particular insurance companies. I have not seen the bill, which is from the senate. In the first place we have an inspector of insurance at the present time who is over these general life companies. They must qualify for a certificate every year. You may remember that a few years ago, away back in 1928, 1929 and 1930, my hon. friends on the left here were objecting to the policy which allowed these companies to invest the premiums, the trust funds of their policyholders in common stocks all over the world. What was the result of that policy? Some of them could not qualify for an insurance certificate. I remember when, after the stock market collapsed in 1929 or 1930—I think it was around there—some of the stock they then held was quoted at 98 today and sold for 8 on the market tomorrow. But they got a certificate under the Insurance Act and some of them were in a dangerous condition. As a matter of fact, that was admitted and was proven by my hon. friends on the left and others.

I want to point out what was done during the war by some of the companies. When our engineers, doctors and surgeons went overseas, they had a difficult time carrying out payments on their premiums because their practice was gone when they went overseas. What is the policy of the government regarding this company? The Minister of Finance should be here to answer for the finance department, because the inspector of insurance is over these life companies. I will say this about them, they are all fine companies and made a great record of life insurance in this country. There is no doubt about that at all. They are well officered and run.

[Mr. Speaker.]

What I say now is subject to what I said before about common stock. In the twenties I brought a bill in the House of Commons in order to do away with their investing in common stocks all over the world, and to see that these companies should not be allowed to invest trust fund premiums in common stock without the consent of this parliament; because, as you will remember, there were large sums of money lost out of Canada on risks by pretty nearly all of them. They could invest in common stocks all over the world. What is the policy of the government, regarding this life company? Has it passed the inspector of insurance? Of course that does not mean a great deal. The inspector just looks over the preamble of the bill, sees who the incorporators are and all that kind of thing.

There is another thing I wish to call to the attention of the committee. A great many soldiers have come back from the war, and they have had trouble over housing and all that kind of thing. A great many soldiers had difficulty regarding their policies of insurance. I raised in the house the other day the question of excessive interest rates, but I did not get a satisfactory answer. The banks were charging them 4½ per cent interest on a loan for a small amount. For example, a small businessman may have a policy. He applies to the bank for something and they will not give it to him. They have to telephone from a little bit of branch bank to headquarters in order to lend a man money on current account. He may not have adequate security. The banker tells him, "Oh, you have a policy of insurance. I will keep that as security for you. I want it as collateral in my bank." They used to charge the banks 4½ or 5 per cent. "You have to leave it in the bank for a while and then I am going to transfer you to the insurance company". What are they charging? I raised the question the other day, and there was not a newspaper in Canada that published one line of the answer; not even C.B.C. or the Canadian Press did. As to the radio, it is hopeless. Some of these companies are charging over ten per cent on policies of these poor soldiers who have paid their premiums. Every year they are paid up. What are they paying today? I can tell you. It is or may be the rate written in the policy—six per cent. There is no such thing as six per cent. Government bonds were down to two per cent. Yet the insurance companies are charging the poor people who defended this country and defended these companies at the risk of their lives, six per cent and more on their policies. That is what they are doing. The banks turn loans over to them. They want to get

the bank rates increased by this house. Some on this side of the house are advocating increased interest rates to a small man who has a store on bank interest. Some on this side of the house have advocated the raising of bank interest rates. They had better go back home and ask their constituents and ask also the bankers something about it before they propose it from this side of the house, because I am absolutely opposed to it. I can tell you I am a Conservative first, last and all the time. They can change their name all they like. I have always been a progressive, but I am too modest to call myself by that name. In those days, however, we had some support in this house for the doctrine of this party, which called for our own markets, for our own products and our own work for our own workmen.

I have nothing against the young member who is sponsoring this life insurance bill. He is a very likeable person, and I do not want to oppose his measure. But I should like to find out the policy of the Minister of Finance with regard to these life companies. Do we need any more of them at the present time? The banks charge something for transferring money from a bank to an insurance company, but the insurance companies not only charge the six per cent, as set out on the policy on their loans; they add a lot just for exchange, and I can tell you the poor people cannot stand it. There is at present no such thing as six per cent interest. During the war we got only two and three per cent on bonds.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. I would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that we are on section 1 of the bill.

Mr. CHURCH: You are quite right, Mr. Chairman, but I am raising the general question: do we need any more of these companies, in view of the number we have already? Some of them could not be called federal companies at all by the widest stretch of the imagination. I wonder what is the policy of the government. The Minister of Finance has control over the life insurance companies, and surely we should have some statement of policy from the government with regard to this matter. What is the minister doing? Has he recommended this bill?

Mr. FERGUSON: I would call attention to the fact that we are not discussing life insurance. Any company carrying on a fire and casualty business in this country cannot carry on life insurance; and this company cannot make loans. The committee should understand that we are trying to keep this money in Canada for Canadians, and I believe we should issue more charters along these lines.

At the present time about fifty per cent of the premiums collected in this country for the casualty and fire insurance goes to foreign countries. It is just too bad that we have not twice as many Canadian companies, and that the citizens of Canada do not insist that their money go to those companies. This is one way of keeping money here and creating employment for Canadians. This is a good charter.

Mr. COLDWELL: I quite agree with the last speaker that too much of the money we spend on insurance premiums is drained out of Canada. That is true, and I think we shall have to consider ways and means of keeping that money in Canada. But I do not believe we should adopt the method proposed under this bill, that of setting up another company of this description. What has been done in Saskatchewan in connection with automobile insurance should, I think, be a lesson to all in Canada. When a person in Saskatchewan takes out a licence to drive an automobile he also pays a dollar extra, and the owner of the automobile pays from \$4.50 up to \$6 for a passenger car. That indicates the amount necessary to protect an individual pretty adequately.

Mr. REID: What is the protection?

Mr. COLDWELL: I will come to that in a moment. I carry a policy on my automobile covering fire, theft, \$50 deductible collision and public liability, and for that I think I paid \$64.30 this year. But I personally am not insured, nor are the pedestrians in this province necessarily insured, if I should happen to hit someone with my automobile. All they can do is sue and endeavour to prove negligence on my part, if they want to collect anything by way of indemnity for the accident. That is in Ontario, with a private company. But with the small premium of from \$4.50 to \$6 in the province of Saskatchewan I am insured. If anything happens to me my widow, we will say, would get an indemnity of \$10,000, paid from the insurance fund. The pedestrians on the street are insured, and they do not have to prove negligence in order to collect. The automobile is insured against collision, with \$100 deductible; and for all that service the Saskatchewan resident pays from \$4.50 to \$6. A good many people thought it could not be operated for that.

Mr. FERGUSON: The hon. gentleman is suggesting that the type of insurance issued by the province of Saskatchewan makes such a low premium possible, but is it not a fact that it is largely because of the small population? Such insurance would cost you perhaps \$150

in New York city. It does not cost so much in Saskatchewan because there are so few cars in that province.

Mr. COLDWELL: Insurance in this province is so expensive because of the number of private insurance companies—and this is to be paying commissions, collecting fees, and so on. The public pay for that, whereas if everyone is insured without the payment of commissions and so on, the benefits are that much greater. I was going to say to my hon. friend that claims incurred to August 31, 1947, amounted to \$683,389.86, leaving an estimated reserve for adjustment of premiums or benefits of approximately \$850,000. In other words, after paying some \$683,000 in damages and in indemnities to persons killed or injured in automobile accidents, they had \$850,000 left in reserve. And I may add that all those claims were paid without legal intervention, without taking matters into the courts. If an individual is injured hospital bills are taken care of; an indemnity is paid for a number of weeks if he is a breadwinner; and protection such as I cannot get from a private company is given under these terms. I may add, though I am not sure of the exact amounts, that because of the large surpluses which have been accumulated this year the province of Saskatchewan has been able to increase the benefits under that automobile insurance act. And as far as fire insurance is concerned, those of us who have had property insured in the province of Saskatchewan know that, since there has been one over-all government policy in regard to insurance through the Saskatchewan government office, rates have been brought down by from ten to twenty-five per cent, and I say that without fear of contradiction.

Mr. REID: Are trucks included?

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, they are included, but they pay a higher rate according to wheel base, weight and other factors. Buses pay the highest rate of all because of the greater risk due to the number of passengers, the weight of the bus, and so on. But one of the points I make is that when I insure my automobile in the province of Ontario and pay for public liability insurance, neither I nor the public is really insured unless it can be proved that I was negligent. They may have to take it to the court, and prove it; whereas under the act to which I have referred, the only proofs that are required are proof of accident, proof of injury or proof of death.

Mr. FERGUSON: Would you be satisfied that the taxpayer should pay out, from the [Mr. Ferguson.]

public funds, in respect of a person who was injured in an accident and cannot prove negligence on the part of the car owner?

Mr. COLDWELL: I have pointed out to my hon. friend this, that the taxpayer bears no cost whatsoever. In the years of experience they have had, \$683,000 has been paid out of the premium fund.

Mr. FERGUSON: Are you sure those claims are adequately reserved at the present time?

Mr. COLDWELL: I was going to say that, in addition, they have built up a reserve of \$850,000 or more. That is in two years; and it is more than they have paid out in accident benefits. That, I would say, is a substantial reserve.

Mr. FERGUSON: Would you make a comparison with an Ontario stock company at the same time you are making this comparison?

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, certainly. So far as the Ontario stock company is concerned, if I take out a policy in that stock company I know I am protected, so far as the policy which I own is liable for that protection. But the thing I am pointing out is this, that the time has arrived when the multiplicity of these insurance companies, all of which are collecting heavy premiums and high rates, and pay fairly substantial commissions, is something which we should consider, as a parliament, with a view to reducing the extortionate rates which are now paid for fire insurance, automobile insurance and other forms of insurance permitted under this bill.

I say it is something we should go into carefully. All I am doing is this: I am trying to give the committee an actual example of something that has been done in one of the provinces, something which was beneficial to all the people of that province.

It is true, as hon. members may remark in a moment, that this insurance is compulsory. Well, why should we not have compulsory insurance?

Mr. CASE: Everything compulsory.

Mr. COLDWELL: No, not everything compulsory. Let me say this to my hon. friend: is it fair, for example, that one man should carry insurance to protect the public—for that is what it amounts to? Then he is hit by a man who has not assumed his responsibility to the public. That man cannot make good the loss which follows a collision, or something of that kind.

I have had that experience, myself, where a man in this city while driving a car ran into me and was, so far as I knew—and I inquired into the circumstances—a man I could not ask to

MARCH 12, 1948

pay. He had a large family and a very small wage. He should not have been running an automobile, if he could not pay for insurance.

Mr. CASE: Ontario looks after that.

Mr. COLDWELL: Consequently, where everybody pays, where you have not to go out and get insurance from a private company, and pay commissions, you are able to provide a service to your people which is unequalled by any private company. And I defy anybody to deny that fact.

Mr. FERGUSON: I deny it. Do you consider that the wages paid by insurance companies in Ontario and Quebec today—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. COLDWELL: Well, the hon. member can make his speech later, although I have no objection to his interruptions or his questioning.

Mr. FERGUSON: He defied anyone to reply.

Mr. COLDWELL: What the hon. member says gives me a good opening to say something I had in mind. I would say to him that if we are to have protection at the high cost of maintaining a large overhead, then that protection is too dear. And that is precisely what my hon. friend suggested by his question, namely, that we should maintain a high overhead in order to get very few benefits.

I have no more objection to this bill than I have to a good many others of the same sort which come before the House of Commons. But I do say that bills of this description coming before the house should be considered by the house. I do not think a bill of this kind should be allowed just to pass through simply because it provides for another insurance company. We owe a duty to the people who sent us here to see that these bills are carefully examined by the House of Commons before they are allowed to go through.

When we consider insurance of this description we should consider what is being done, and make comparisons with the other facilities of the same sort available to the people of Canada. All I have tried to do is to point out that the people of one of our provinces who own automobiles, and pay a very small fee, are able to get protection such as no insurance company will give.

Mr. LENNARD: What protection do you get?

Mr. COLDWELL: I thought I told the hon. member. I do not wish to keep repeating for hon. members who either were not here or were not paying attention.

Mr. LENNARD: I was here. I never heard you. I did not hear the hon. member say what the benefits were.

Mr. MICHAUD: If you had been here you would.

Mr. LENNARD: I was here.

Mr. MICHAUD: I heard him.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I must suggest again that when we are in committee hon. members should not interrupt the hon. member who has the floor. They will have their opportunity to speak as soon as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart takes his seat.

Mr. COLDWELL: If I may put this on the record, this policy includes accident insurance against death or injury from motor vehicle accidents. There are five types of benefits under the policy. The principal sum for loss of life—

Mr. CASE: Which is how much?

Mr. COLDWELL: —is \$10,000 to any one person; the principal sum for dismemberment; weekly indemnity for loss of income which is, I believe, \$20 a week.

Mr. KNOWLES: For up to 150 weeks.

Mr. COLDWELL: Quite right.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): How many persons for loss of life?

Mr. COLDWELL: And then, hospital, medical and funeral expenses and out-of-pocket expenses; collision insurance for all licensed Saskatchewan motor vehicles with a deductible of \$100 for private passenger cars and small trucks and up to \$500 for trucks and buses. Then, public liability—insurance is provided to the extent of the amount payable to any person under the accident provisions. That is to say, if I hit somebody on the street he is entitled to indemnity up to the limit of the accident provision to which I have already referred.

Mr. REID: Have you the number of licences issued?

Mr. COLDWELL: In Saskatchewan?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): And, in that provision for \$10,000, how many lives in one accident?

Mr. COLDWELL: It is \$10,000 to each person killed in an accident, as I understand it, and it depends upon whether the person involved is the breadwinner of a family. I am sure my hon. friend who is a lawyer knows this, that if you take a case to court the

amount payable as compensation in respect of individuals killed depends upon the status of those individuals. For instance, if it is a child, with no earning ability, the compensation usually allowed is very small, just about enough to pay hospital bills and funeral expenses. Under the Saskatchewan act the maximum is \$625 for each child.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I was merely asking for information. The hon. member referred to \$10,000 in the event of loss of life. I was trying to find out what would happen if three or four people were killed. Would the \$10,000 cover all of them, or is it \$10,000 each?

Mr. COLDWELL: It is \$10,000 for each person killed in an accident; \$5,000 for public liability or \$10,000 maximum for any person killed in an accident.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I just did not understand it.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is all right; I am glad to bring that out. Then there is property damage insurance to the extent of the amount payable over the deductible sum of \$100 in collisions.

As I have said, it provides protection that cannot be duplicated in any other plan in Canada. Over 85 per cent of those killed and the same percentage of those injured in auto accidents would not have received benefits if the plan had been based on the ordinary type of liability insurance. In other words, the experience of Saskatchewan has been, as in many provinces, that there are many people using automobiles who are either not insured or under-insured, and there would have been no protection in many instances but for this insurance plan. This plan is administered by a government insurance office maintained out of premium income.

I want to point out that this plan gives a complete coverage. If you want fire and theft in the policy, it will amount to between \$20 and \$25. But if you take \$25 or even \$30 for fire and theft and add \$4.50 or \$5 you will then have a policy that could not be duplicated anywhere in this dominion by a private company. I say that without fear of contradiction.

When we are permitting the setting up of a new company to handle fire and automobile insurance and the like we ought to give consideration as to how best we can provide our people with protection. I know that property and civil rights are matters within provincial jurisdiction and none of us wants to infringe upon the jurisdiction of the provinces. But again and again we have heard in this house

[Mr. Coldwell.]

the story of level crossing accidents, careless drivers and all the rest of it. I think we had a bill before us on one occasion which would have placed certain drivers under certain circumstances under the criminal code.

My purpose in bringing these facts to the attention of the committee is to impress upon hon. members that today we are paying a great deal in premiums because of the multiplicity of companies doing this kind of work under very high overhead. As my hon. friend said a few minutes ago, a great deal of this money is drained away to other countries. The saving grace of this bill is that it sets up a Canadian company with headquarters in Winnipeg.

But that does not satisfy me. I want to see the Canadian people protected by a form of insurance that will give maximum protection at minimum cost. If anyone wants to see an actual policy issued by the Saskatchewan government, I have one here. This particular policy includes many other features than those I have mentioned. The total premium, apart from the \$4.50, amounts to \$28.96. That gives additional \$20,000 for loss or damage resulting from bodily injury to or death of any one person. There is additional \$20,000 protection for loss or damage resulting from bodily injury to or death of two or more persons. There is legal liability for damage to the property of others of \$2,000 additional in any one accident.

My hon. friend who has this policy and who sits with me here is a citizen of Saskatchewan. Because he wants collision protection, \$25 deductible instead of \$100 provided to everyone, he pays the additional amount to which I have just referred. The actual figures show a premium of \$1.64 for the public liability and damage to person, \$20,000 and \$20,000. For the legal liability for damage to property, \$2,000, the premium is \$5.50. For collision, \$25 deductible, instead of \$100 he pays an extra premium of \$16.

Mr. LENNARD: That is no different from Ontario.

Mr. COLDWELL: But I am pointing out that when you add to the \$28.96 the \$4.50 you get a total of \$33.46 for protection which you could not get from a private company.

Mr. CASE: I have a better one for less money, \$50 and \$100,000.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is public liability. If you wanted an additional \$20,000 under this plan it would cost you only another \$1.64. The hon. member could not buy a policy that would insure him personally as an owner and operator of an automobile for \$10,000 in the

event of death. He cannot buy a policy that will insure the general public without possible contest at law to prove negligence on the part of the driver or the owner of the automobile. That is the point I am making.

Mr. LENNARD: You can get that for \$5 in Ontario.

Mr. COLDWELL: You say you can get it for \$5, but I say you can get everything I have mentioned for from \$4.50 to \$6 in Saskatchewan.

Mr. LENNARD: What is fifty cents?

Mr. FERGUSON: Most insurance companies settle their claims without ever going near the courts. They are settled out of court and without a lawyer.

Mr. COLDWELL: I know that some of them do settle without going to the courts, but the law is there and many of them go to the courts.

Mr. FERGUSON: Ninety per cent of them do not.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is all right for these defenders of private interests, but I am simply saying that many of these claims are settled by action at law.

Mr. LENNARD: Very few.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am saying that if they are not settled by action at law they are settled by lawyers outside the court—

Mr. LENNARD: No, never had a case.

Mr. COLDWELL: —who naturally collect fees for making the settlement. My hon. friends had better read this Saskatchewan insurance plan. If they do they will find that it has much to recommend it. They will realize that we are paying through the nose for much of the inadequate protection we are getting from private companies.

Mr. CHURCH: On a question of privilege, I never could get a copy of this bill on the table until after I had made my speech. It is hard to get bills that come from the senate. I have no objection to the bill, and they are good people, but I think some notice of it should have been given here. As it is listed, one would read it as a life company on our order paper, as called.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

On section 6—Classes of insurance authorized.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River if "(b) automobile insurance" includes public liability and loss of life?

Mr. BENIDICKSON: It would cover the normal policy put out by a stock company for automobile protection.

Mr. KNOWLES: The hon. member is certain that loss of life is covered. It is not specifically set out anywhere else in that section or in the bill.

Mr. BENIDICKSON: This company will not carry on the normal type of life insurance business. This would cover the type of public liability that would follow an automobile accident.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is what I meant.

Section agreed to.

Sections 7 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

EASTERN TRUST COMPANY

The house in committee on Bill No. 49, respecting the Eastern Trust Company—Mr. Isnor—Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Capital stock and shares.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the sponsor of the bill to indicate the reasons for such a large increase in capital, from \$1,000,000 to \$3,000,000?

Mr. ISNOR: This is one of our old and well-established trust companies in the maritime provinces. It has been doing business for a long period of years, in a very efficient manner, and because of that efficiency it has enjoyed exceptionally fine business not only in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island but also in the province of Quebec. The company now finds it necessary to expand its activities. It has recently opened an office in Montreal and it proposes to open offices in Ontario. With that expansion in view, it requires additional funds for mortgages and so on and for that reason is asking for the increase from \$1,000,000 to \$3,000,000.

Section agreed to.

On the title.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I wish to say a word about this, applicable to all these other bills which will come before us. Here we have a bill for an expansion in the capital of the company, while in the previous case we had a bill for the incorporation of a company. I am one of those who believe that the more insurance companies we license, the greater will be the competition and therefore the cost of insurance will be that much less. I am therefore in favour of this bill and the others

like it. I think, however, that we should have a word more from the senior member for Halifax in view of the large increase in capital that is asked for. He merely said that they had expanded their business. I do not want him to think I am opposing the bill. I am not. If it is necessary to vote I will vote for it. Perhaps we had all better stop and consider that unless we are shareholders of the company we have not very much interest in what the capital is. I see that under the bill the present shareholders shall have pro rata opportunities. I do not know what that means. I gather they will have some opportunity of making purchase of shares. The only thing we need to guard against here is the watering of these stocks. If there is no watering of stocks I can see no reason why this House of Commons should not permit the business to proceed in the way it proposes, which it thinks best to carry out its interests, particularly when it increases competition in the line of endeavour in which the company is engaged.

Mr. ISNOR: I wish to thank the hon. member for Calgary West for the thought he has expressed in regard to the general principle of competition. Like him, I believe in competition and I think the creation of competition in any centre is bound to bring about better business methods. In answer to the question regarding watered stock, I assure him there is no such term nowadays in the maritimes, particularly in reference to a business such as this.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Please do not think I suggested that there was.

Mr. ISNOR: The increase is necessary owing to the expansion of the firm's business, in consequence of which they cannot extend additional credits unless they have extra funds. That is common sense.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): More money for lending purposes. That is it in a nutshell, is it not?

Mr. ISNOR: Yes.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I am all for you.

Mr. McMASTER: What is the reserve in this case? If the hon. member believes in competition, there will be no competition in the buying of this stock. It will all go to the shareholders.

Mr. ISNOR: The bill does provide an opportunity for the present shareholders to take up additional new stock if they so desire. [Mr. Smith (Calgary West).]

Otherwise it will be put on the market in the regular way and listed, and the public will have an opportunity to subscribe.

Mr. McMASTER: The hon. member did not answer the question about reserve.

Mr. ISNOR: I am not a shareholder or a director of the company and I am not familiar with the details, but I believe they have about \$500,000. There is a substantial amount in reserve.

Mr. COLDWELL: What kind of business does the company engage in?

Mr. ISNOR: Largely mortgage and loans in connection with estates.

Mr. COLDWELL: The management of estates?

Mr. ISNOR: Yes.

Mr. CASE: Is the stock listed now?

Mr. ISNOR: I have every reason to believe it is.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

TRUST AND LOAN COMPANY OF CANADA

The house in committee on Bill No. 59, respecting the Trust and Loan Company of Canada—Mr. Pinard—Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is the sponsor here?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. KNOWLES: Then there is not much point in asking any questions if he is not here.

Mr. ISNOR: I shall be pleased to endeavour to answer any questions in reference to the bill, although I am not the sponsor.

Mr. COLDWELL: Will the hon. gentleman explain what this bill is? It looks to me a harmless proposal, but I do not know anything about it and I should like to have some information in order to decide whether it is or not.

Mr. MacNICOL: The sponsor is not here. Let it go over another week.

Mr. KNOWLES: Stand.

Mr. ISNOR: If hon. members wish to have it stand that is agreeable to me. This bill was before the banking and commerce committee and was approved by the committee without amendment. Moreover, it was approved by the federal Department of Insur-

ance. It is rather a strange bill in this sense, that instead of seeking an authorization to increase, the company comes to parliament and asks for a reduction because of the peculiar circumstances and the fact that its funds are tied up in England. The background of this company is English. It is an English company doing business largely in Canada. The bill its entire business is done in Canada. The bill was quite fully explained on second reading by the sponsor, and hon. members will find that explanation in *Hansard*. I do not know whether they wish me to take up the time of the committee to go over that ground again, but I feel that the explanation given to the committee was such that all hon. members were satisfied as to the merits of the bill. They felt that no question would be raised by hon. members who had looked into the merits of the bill. For the information of hon. members, may I say that they will find all questions answered and details given in *Hansard* on pages 1929, 1930 and 1931 of March 5.

Mr. COLDWELL: As I understand it, this bill is before the committee on account of certain exchange difficulties.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is correct. My department looked into this bill. I think it is quite unobjectionable. The company is a very old established one. The control is in England and, as my hon. friend said, this capital reorganization is prompted for reasons which will appeal to all hon. members. I do not wish to intervene in the debate; I could express my own personal opinion, but I do not really think any objection could be taken to the capital reorganization.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): As I understand it, broadly speaking this is merely a reduction in the capital and, if so, I do not see any objection to it.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PEOPLE'S FRATERNAL ORDER

The house in committee on Bill No. 115, to incorporate People's Fraternal Order—Mr. Croll—Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Incorporation.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is this not the bill, the title of which received some objection in the house the other day? Is this not rather a

wide sort of title, "An act to incorporate the People's Fraternal Order"? Does it not take in a lot of territory, and was it not suggested to the sponsor that that might be considered? I notice the sponsor of the bill is not here. Is there anybody else in the committee who can answer for him?

Mr. CLEAVER: I chaired the banking and commerce committee to which this bill was referred and I have just one suggestion to make in regard to these bills that are referred. All parties have representatives on the committees, and have the fullest possible opportunity to be heard. At the time this bill was before the committee it was gone into carefully and there were no objections of any kind as to the question of name. I personally cannot see any objection to it. If my hon. friend would elaborate on what he has in mind as to the objection to the name I would understand his inquiry.

Mr. COLDWELL: It struck me that the People's Fraternal Order is a pretty wide sort of title. It does not mean anything to me. It seems to me that the title of an organization approved by the parliament of Canada should mean a little more than this title does. It seems to be a closed corporation. I notice that section 5 dealing with membership says:

Only persons acceptable to the society, or the wife or husband or any child of a person already a member shall be admitted as members of the society.

And so on. That does not seem to be as all-inclusive as the title. The title is pretty inclusive; it includes everybody, including members of this house. I have no objection to the bill, particularly, but I think the title is rather too broad and that some consideration should be given to it before the house passes the bill. Titles usually mean something and are usually more restrictive, indicating the type of membership to be expected under this charter. That is a point which should be considered.

Mr. CLEAVER: I should like to assure the committee, if I may, that the superintendent of insurance was present when this bill was before the committee as well as the chief of the actuarial branch. They gave evidence to the committee and informed us that the new proposed company as set up was actually sound. No question whatever was raised as to the name. The sponsor of the bill is not in the house tonight.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I want to associate myself entirely with the remarks made by the leader of the C.C.F. party. In

these days we are learning more and more who people are. It seems to me that at this time we should not pass bills with titles of this kind. It would not be a great deal of bother to anyone to change the name. It does seem to me that we should not pass a thing using a great big, broad word like "people", which indicates nothing. I do not mind if people coin a word where you have to make inquiries to find out what it is all about, but I do object to the use of a word such as "people". You may as well call it, "The churches So-and-so", or "humanity", or something of that kind. It does seem to me that it would not be a great deal of trouble to ask the assistant sponsor of the bill to see if the name could be changed. It would not be much trouble to change the word and get one which would be much more attractive, because the way the thing stands it does not mean very much.

Mr. CHURCH: Is there some way in which we may have a better listing of these bills? Copies should be on the table. How are we to know whether it is life or fire insurance? These bills come from the senate, and we never see them.

Progress reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour reserved for private bills having expired the house will now revert to its business prior to six o'clock.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT PROVISION FOR EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS, MINIMUM PRICE OF WHEAT DELIVERIES, ETC.

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Howe:

That it is expedient to present a bill to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, to authorize the board to provide pensions for members, officers and employees and to make provision for the increase of the fixed minimum price on wheat deliveries; to extend the control of interprovincial movements of wheat products and to empower the governor in council to extend the present system to oats or barley and on the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Ross (Souris).

Mr. POULIOT: I adjourned the debate at six o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. POULIOT: I was under the impression that my hon. friend was through with his speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. POULIOT: As he told me he was not, I shall follow the precedent and wait until he is through.

[Mr. Smith (Calgary West).]

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at six o'clock I had just read certain telegrams and letters which indicated the desire of the government of Saskatchewan to have complementary legislation passed to enable this bill to be put into force at the earliest day possible. As far as we in this group are concerned, we are just as anxious as is the Saskatchewan government to see that this legislation is brought into force for the handling of the 1948 crop; and anything we can do in this house will be done to further that objective.

I was indicating that I thought it was probably out of place perhaps for the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), in view of the actions of the government in failing to expedite its passage, to be accusing the opposition of holding up this measure. Last year we moved or tried to move an amendment, when the wheat board act was being amended, to do this very thing which we are doing this year. The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden) moved that amendment, but we were told that it was unconstitutional and that there were many things which could not be done. As a result it was not done, and we had the fiasco that we had this last fall in connection with coarse grains. Had our amendment been accepted last year, or had this amendment been made last year, there would not have been the need for the rush today that apparently there is.

In the second place I believe that this measure should have been introduced in the pre-Christmas session, so that the provincial governments would have had time to give proper consideration to the type of complementary legislation that would be necessary for them to pass to implement in full the proposed amendment.

The third reason why I believe the government has failed is that it has not called the provinces together to consider the matter. I think it was the place of the dominion government to ask the provinces to get together on this matter. I am sure that, had they done so, there would have been consultations between the provinces before this. I do not know what the attitude of the province of Alberta and of the province of Manitoba may be. Apparently, the province of Manitoba has, as yet, made no representations to the government with regard to it. Probably they are waiting until the measure receives its final reading here. But at this late day it is extremely doubtful whether the provinces will be able, in their regular sessions, to pass the necessary implementing legislation to put this legislation into effect this year. It may be that if they are anxious to do so, by calling a special session they will

MARCH 12, 1948

be able to. I know that in Saskatchewan the demand for it is such that the provincial government will, if necessary, call a special session of the legislature to deal with the matter. I do not know whether the other provinces are prepared to do that or not.

I should like to deal for a short time with the first matter dealt with in the bill, namely, the initial payment on the participation certificate. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) stated that the government were not putting the amount in the bill. The reason given was that if at any future time they wanted to increase the payment, they would be able to do so without bringing in another amendment. Perhaps I am a bit suspicious, but I wonder if perhaps the reason may not have been that if they had put an amount in the bill, it would have meant that that amount would have been the floor price during the remainder of the contract. Since we are amending the bill at the present time, it leaves the \$1.35 floor which is in the original bill.

Mr. HOWE: No. My hon. friend has not read the bill.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, I have read the bill.

Mr. HOWE: You did not read it correctly. The initial payment, whatever it is increased to now, will be the floor. For example, if it is increased to \$1.75, \$1.75 becomes the floor for the entire period.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. HOWE: Read the bill.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is a little bit indefinite in the bill. It says "during that pool period." I did not know whether "that pool period" meant the year or the five-year period. I thought that if it had been the five-year period, it would have said "during the pool period" rather than "during that pool period." I am glad the minister has cleared that matter up, and that whatever price is paid will be the floor price for the entire pool period.

I would suggest that the government try to make this payment as large as possible. If there ever was a time when it was needed in the west, it is at the present time after the crop failure we had over a large part of the west last year. With the amount that is available for this payment—and I believe it is \$234 million—I think a fairly substantial payment could be made, especially if the government would accept certain of the recommendations which I believe all parties of the opposition agree should be accepted. One is that the farmers and growers of wheat should not be asked to subsidize the domestic use of flour

in Canada. Last year we were selling wheat to the millers in Canada for \$1.58½ a bushel. I do not know what the average price was last year for all the wheat sold; but I think, when that average price has been determined for all the wheat sold, the dominion government should be prepared to pay into the wheat board fund the difference between \$1.58½ and that average price which was obtained for the 1947 crop. If that principle were carried out during the other years, 1945, 1946 and 1947, and were carried forward, it would mean that the participation certificates paid out in 1950 would be worth something. It would mean also that the government would be able to make a larger payment on the participation certificates at the present time. I do not see why the wheat growers should be asked to subsidize the consumption of flour in Canada. Nor do I believe that they should be asked to subsidize the British wheat contract.

I have been opposed to the idea of paying too much at the present time. I do not think we can determine what sacrifices the farmers will have made under the British wheat contract until that contract is terminated in 1949. When it is terminated in 1949 I think this government should be prepared to do as I have suggested should be done with regard to the flour consumed in Canada, namely, that when they have finally determined what the average price obtained for the wheat is, they should be prepared to pay into the wheat board fund the difference between the price obtained under the British wheat contract and the average price for the wheat in those particular years. If that were done, I believe it would make up at least in part to the wheat growers the increase there has been in the cost of production on account of the removal of price ceilings in Canada; because undoubtedly there has been a great increase in the cost of farm machinery and in the cost of all those things which go into the cost of producing wheat in this country. Our twine went up last year to almost double what it had been. Farm machinery went up first by 12½ per cent and then something over 15 per cent. All other costs have gone up. Unless something is done, it is hard for the western producer to understand just why his prices should be frozen when prices of the things that go into his cost of production continue to rise.

I should now like to say a few words with regard to coarse grains. Last year our amendment, which would have brought coarse grains under the wheat board, was not accepted, with the result that the price ceiling was lifted on October 21. Immediately the price

of coarse grains went up by from twenty to thirty cents a bushel. Never in my experience in western Canada have I heard such a howl of protest as went up across the prairies when that action was taken by the government. So many protests came to the Liberal association of Saskatchewan that they felt it necessary to take some action, and they came to Ottawa to see if something could be done about it. The government say they are leaving it to the companies in the first place; that when the line elevator companies, the pools and the grain handling firms have made some restitution to the farmers from the profits they have made, then the government will be prepared to step in and do something. They have not said what they will do; but I want to point out the position in which they are placing some of the grain handling firms. Many of those firms, especially the smaller ones, had eastern customers whom they continued to supply with normal shipments; in other words they were not withholding grain from the market. Other companies perhaps more astute, believing this action would be taken, for at least a month before the ceilings came off supplied their customers with the very least they could get away with. They were withholding grain and, as a result, those companies will be able to make a much better settlement than the other companies which continued to supply their eastern customers in the normal manner.

I believe the government should have averaged the price for the first month, then made a return to the farmers on the basis of that average price for coarse grains during the first month after the ceiling was lifted. Then they could have gone to these companies and collected any money they made. As the matter stands at the present time, if the farmers are to get a fair return on any profits made by the milling companies or the feed processors, that money will have to come out of the treasury of this country. Otherwise the farmer will not get a fair return on these coarse grains. Had that policy been followed, these coarse grains could have been paid for long ago. More money would have been in circulation in western Canada, and the farmers would have been in a much better position. That policy was not followed. We do not know yet on what basis the government will make these payments; we have had no indication as to what it will be.

I should like to point out also that in connection with this whole bill our position is quite clear. We are prepared to support everything in this bill. It does not go as far [Mr. Wright.]

as we would like to see it go. We believe it should include all grains. That is what western agriculture has been asking for—

Mr. MUTCH: Some of it.

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the hon. member name any organizations in western Canada that have not been asking for it?

Mr. MUTCH: I was not speaking of organizations; I was speaking of farmers.

Mr. WRIGHT: There may be individual farmers who have not asked for it, but certainly I have not heard of any organization that has not been asking to have all coarse grains placed under the wheat board. We are prepared to do all we can to expedite the passage of this bill—

Mr. HOWE: Then the best thing you can do is sit down.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am going to sit down in a moment, though many other people have spoken a good deal longer than I have on this matter. I just want to make it perfectly clear that, as far as this group is concerned, nothing will be done to hinder or delay the passage of this bill.

Mr. DIFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. POULIOT: I rise to a point of order. I do not wish to be unpleasant to the hon. member, but I adjourned the debate at six o'clock, when I was the only member to rise; and later I gave my place to the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright).

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must say to the hon. member for Temiscouata, first, that when he rose to adjourn the debate the hon. member for Melfort had the floor; second, that it is not the practice to adjourn the debate at six o'clock; third, that when the hon. member for Melfort rose to speak the hon. member for Lake Centre was on his feet, the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) was on his feet and the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch) was also on his feet. So I believe I should give the floor to the hon. member for Lake Centre.

Mr. POULIOT: I ask the house to decide, by virtue of the rules, who has the right to speak. There is a rule to that effect, and you know it.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is the desire of the hon. member to take the matter to the house he should have put a motion.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes; I want a vote on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lake Centre.

Mr. J. G. DIFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the concluding remarks of the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright), when he said it was most unfair that the farmers should have been required to subsidize the consumers in Canada in connection with the price of bread. With that there can be no disagreement. However, he added that it was also most unfair and unjust that the farmers should have been required to subsidize the British wheat agreement, and he felt that at the conclusion of that agreement, in the event there was any difference between the world price and the price paid under it, that difference should be made up by the people of Canada as a whole. The latter statement was most interesting, having regard to the attitude taken by the C.C.F. party when my leader and those associated with him took that same stand. My leader and they have stood alone in that view during the past two or three years. Only now, when my hon. friend and those associated with him are beginning to realize that the campaign on behalf of the western farmer waged by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) is securing support, when all through the piece hon. gentlemen of the C.C.F. supported the government and opposed the stand taken by my leader, are they coming to see that it is well to back track a little and support the position the leader of this party has taken throughout?

I am now going to deal with this bill and with the remarks made this afternoon by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker). I always listen to the hon. member with a great deal of interest. He always has a great deal to say; he says it well, and he says it in such a way that everyone can hear him. He raised the old dodge that we on this side of the house, having asked that this bill be separated, would be committing the unpardonable offence of delaying the passage of the bill and the payment to the western farmers of the amount provided under the bill.

First and foremost in that connection I agree with the hon. member for Melfort. He saw through what was taking place in this connection. This bill could have been brought down earlier. It should have been brought down earlier, so that full and complete discussion could have taken place on the subject.

I am not going with him when he said he was suspicious. I am not suspicious; I believe it is a fact that the reason this bill was not brought down earlier was to deny us the

opportunity of holding the government responsible for its failure in connection with its wheat policy in the past few years. They say, in effect, "Take it all, regardless of whether it is constitutional, regardless of whether it can be carried into effect."

They ask us to accept this omelette that deals with pensions for employees and payments to farmers, and the promise of the possibility, some time in the future, of the implementing, by order in council, of control over oats and barley.

So far as this oats and barley deal is concerned, again I do not want to be suspicious, but when it is introduced just on the verge of a general election in Saskatchewan it arouses one's interest as to the reason it is being introduced. Only a year ago, on February 27, 1947, an amendment was introduced to bring oats and barley under the act, and the answer given at that time by the government through the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilsley) was, in effect, "It is not constitutional; it is dangerous; it cannot be done"—and all the other expressions that are used when a question of something being ultra vires is advanced. Have things changed in the last year, since February 27, 1947?

The only change that has taken place is that there was not a provincial election coming up in 1947, but there is one coming up in 1948. How are they to bring it about? Well, they do not say they will do it. They speak of enabling legislation and complementary legislation.

Even if complementary legislation were passed by the Saskatchewan legislature—and it would be, because the premier has already stated that that will be done, and, if necessary, that a special session will be called—can this legislation be made operative? It will be dangled before the people as to what might have been; there is no sadder word of tongue or pen than it might have been.

Supposing Alberta comes in with it; can it be brought into effect? I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) this question: if two provinces have passed enabling legislation, can it effectively be brought in? The answer is: No, it cannot—or even with three. That legislation can be brought in and be effectual under the constitutional powers of this country, according to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilsley) himself, who averred its unconstitutionality, only provided that each and every province affected introduces enabling legislation where and if oats and barley are to be marketed.

Mr. HOWE: Is that your legal opinion?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is the legal opinion of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. HOWE: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I beg your pardon?

Mr. HOWE: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): It is in *Hansard*.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I would not expect agreement from the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. HOWE: Would you like me to read the opinion of the Minister of Justice?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner); no, not the Minister of Agriculture, but my hon. friend has been in practically every other department—

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend can at least be a gentleman; I have yet to see any indication of it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is there anything ungentlemanly in paying a tribute to the minister who holds nearly all the portfolios?

Mr. HOWE: It is very cheap politics, very cheap comedy.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I say to my right hon. friend that if he has any interruptions to make, let him speak up so that they can be heard.

Mr. HOWE: I will be pleased to. I wish to say that when we are discussing a wheat bill it is very cheap comedy to try to trade on the name of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is cheap comedy to think of my right hon. friend as having all the portfolios! He is not satisfied. He controls industry all over Canada; he controls the right of industry to live; and now he takes over the greatest monopoly in the history of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the bill.

Mr. HOWE: Criminal lawyer, doing his stuff, talking to the gallery.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What is that?

Mr. HOWE: A cheap lawyer, talking to the gallery.

Mr. JACKMAN: Make him withdraw.

Mr. GRAYDON: What about that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

[Mr. Howe.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not ask for a withdrawal of a statement such as that. It is the measure of the right hon. gentleman who makes it. And, sir, my right hon. friend does not get aroused unless he is faced with facts and begins to realize that we know what he is trying to do, in regard to this national problem.

We have this legislation promising to the farmers of western Canada that oats and barley will be dealt with under the wheat board, and it is nothing more or less than a delusion and a snare. It is designed to lead them to believe in a state of affairs which the government fully well realizes that constitutionally it cannot carry into effect.

I now pass on to another portion of the bill. That is this. The government ask us to accept the bill, comprising four distinct matters. They ask us at this time to bring into effect a system of pensions in connection with the operations of the wheat board in this country. Does anyone know the identity of the individuals of the wheat board with the salaries they receive? That question was asked—

Mr. McILRAITH: The hon. member for Souris read a list of salaries this afternoon. It is on the record.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I did not say "list of salaries"; I said the identity of the individuals receiving them.

Mr. McILRAITH: And the scale of salaries.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No, no.

Mr. McILRAITH: Oh, yes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I never made such a statement. The list of salaries was asked for in committee on July 1, 1947—that was the committee on agriculture—and the answer given was, "We pay high salaries, and we do not think it is fair to reveal them". I can give the exact words when, on July 1, 1947, the then minister of trade and commerce used these words:

We have an organization that for years has been paying high salaries. I think it would be unfair if we had to place on public record the salaries we pay to the wheat board.

That was the answer which was given. What is the position of affairs? Why is it that this government continues year after year to build up a civil service in this country outside the operations of the Civil Service Act. That is not fair to a man in the civil service who devotes his life to the service of his country.

Think of the list of salaries referred to this afternoon by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross). He said there were eleven receiving

from \$10,000 to \$15,000, as I remember it. There is one between \$9,000 and \$10,000; two between \$8,000 and \$9,000, and so forth.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): And one at \$15,000.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is the chairman of the board, a man who has been on the board for many years and who has had wide experience in connection with wheat. We are asked to bring in a system of pensions for civil servants to be paid for, not by the people of Canada but by the farmers, to be deducted from the amount of the pool in which they are entitled to participate. Is there any justification for setting up a great organization as this government is setting up outside the civil service, and for paying them tremendous salaries? Why are they not put in the same position as civil servants whose pension scheme by way of superannuation is payable by the state? Why should we be required on second reading to adopt the government plan in this regard and give support to a course of conduct that cannot be justified?

No one knows what it is going to cost. I saw a computation the other day which showed that the setting up of this pension scheme would take approximately \$2,000,000 of moneys which should go to the farmers. Is there any reason why the western farmer again should be penalized as he has been in the past, as, for example, under the British agreement? All of us want to do everything possible for Great Britain, and everyone in this house has given her support. Canada as a nation should show her appreciation of the sacrifices which the British people have suffered, but that appreciation should not be required to rest upon the farmers in the form of lower prices. It should be assumed by the Canadian people as a whole.

Until a year ago it was impossible to get any figures in regard to the operations of the wheat board. I want to thank the Minister of Justice in this regard. In February, 1947—I can give the exact date if required—I asked that something be done to furnish the farmers with an annual accounting, so that they would be able to see what was being done with their wheat and what disposition was being made of their money. The right hon. gentleman asked me whether it would be satisfactory to present a report similar to that presented from year to year by the Canadian National Railways. That was acceptable, and a full and complete report was given to the last committee on agriculture.

What do we find as a result of an examination of those accounts? We find that the wheat business of this country is the greatest

single business any government has ever gone into. It is the biggest business the Canadian people are engaged in. Between September 15, 1935, and July 31, 1946, the total value of the grain purchased by the wheat board amounted to \$3,103,551,000.

What about the cost of handling? What about the expenses in connection with that? They amounted to \$244,862,266, or almost a quarter of a billion dollars. What do we find on examining the accounts? We find that since 1939 the expenses of administration have gone up 3.31 times. Approximately the same amount of wheat was handled in 1946 as in 1939. Salaries have gone up 3.48 times; rents have gone up 2.9 times, and travelling expenses, 4.58 times. I can understand that travelling expenses would be larger because of the greater duties assumed by the wheat board in 1943, 1944 and 1945.

Mr. TUCKER: Will the hon. gentleman not admit that the greater proportion of that, over 80 per cent, is the actual carrying charges on the wheat that had to be carried over?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not think it is 80 per cent.

Mr. TUCKER: It is 82.08 per cent, carrying charges at the elevators.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I will not argue that because I did not get the same figures. I know it is high. I am pointing out the expenses of administration, the total expenses in connection with the administration of the wheat board.

Mr. TUCKER: They are only 2.16 of the total cost.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: When it comes to talking about total cost—

Mr. TUCKER: You said cost of administration.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I know what I said; total costs of handling is what I said.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is what you said.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I know of the difference between costs of handling and costs of administration. I referred to costs of handling. Auditing costs approximately \$58,000 a year, and that is beside this vast army of employees, some 650 in number. In fact the cost today of auditing where permanent auditors are kept on who give monthly reports, is approximately \$1,110 a month.

These are things that should be looked into because the wheat board, as it was originally set up by the Bennett government, was

designed to give the largest possible return to the western farmer. As a matter of fact under government policy during the last two or three years the purpose of the wheat board has been to keep prices down for the farmer's wheat, instead of assuring him the largest possible return in that connection.

I can give an example. When evidence was given last year before the agriculture committee the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Harkness) asked Mr. McIvor, the chairman, with regard to an item of \$979,046 of accrued interest. The hon. member asked whether that would be paid to the farmers and Mr. McIvor's answer was, "I doubt that it will." I realize that as far as the Minister of Trade and Commerce is concerned, a million dollars means nothing because he once told the hon. member—

Mr. HOWE: Here he goes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: —for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) that a million dollars was meaningless. That is what my right hon. friend said. When the suggestion was made that it could be saved, he said, "What is a million dollars?" That is simply a continuation in the days of peace of the million dollar mentality of the days of war with nothing under parliamentary control.

Mr. GARDINER: Is my hon. friend opposed to the wheat board?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No.

Mr. HOWE: What is the purpose of this attack on the wheat board?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: This is not an attack. Is this not interesting? A while ago my right hon. friend said that I was attacking him. The right hon. gentleman as minister is, according to Mr. McIvor's evidence, actually the dominant controller of the wheat board operations on behalf of the government. That is the situation. What I am asking is that the wheat board be used, not as an exponent of government policy but as it was originally intended to be used, namely, as an instrument whereby the farmer would be assured of the largest possible return for his production. I can understand why the government gets annoyed.

Mr. GARDINER: Not annoyed; just nailing you down.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, I do not know who is doing the nailing, but I think it is the other way around. In the two years, 1945 and 1946, 233,000 western farmers, as a result of government policy on wheat, lost \$1,600 each on an average. Bring the wheat board back [Mr. Diefenbaker.]

in its proper position; utilize it as it was intended to be utilized, as an instrument whereby unfairness and exploitation would be done away with and the largest possible return that could be assured would be given, less reasonable cost of administration.

Mr. TUCKER: Will the hon. member permit a question? Will he explain why, if the situation is as he states, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and organized farmers in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta support the wheat board?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am interested to know that my hon. friend the member for Rosthern is becoming such a friend of the federation of agriculture.

Mr. TUCKER: Why do you not answer the question?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Last year, at the last session, an amendment was introduced whereby participation certificates would be paid on the 1945 crop. That amendment was introduced into the house—

Mr. GARDINER: No; it was not.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes, it was in committee.

Mr. GARDINER: No; it was to increase the initial payment.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It was an amendment whereby—

Mr. TUCKER: Answer the question.

Mr. HOWE: He is an artful dodger.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: —participation certificates would be paid on the 1945 crop, and that was asked for by the federation of agriculture.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes; that is right.

Mr. BOUCHER: Who is doing the dodging over there now?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: So the Minister of Trade and Commerce was not right a moment ago—

Mr. HOWE: Make your own speech and leave the Minister of Trade and Commerce out of it.

Mr. GARDINER: It was not the Minister of Trade and Commerce who said it was not done. I said it was not done and I am correcting myself now.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Thank you. As a matter of fact it has always been that way with the Minister of Trade and Commerce and those who exercise absolute power.

Mr. TUCKER: Answer my question.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: They resent any criticism and they deny any suggestions or ideas. What I am trying to point out is that the hon. member for Rosthern, who today paid such high tribute to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and it deserves it, one year ago was not heard when there was before the house the matter which he today said he agreed with, that the moneys of the farmers should be distributed to them. Last year when that matter was before the House of Commons the hon. member for Rosthern did not give to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and its recommendations the support he gave to those recommendations today.

Mr. TUCKER: Why do you not answer my question?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We on this side of the house, without any exception, have asked that the farmer's money should be paid to him. That was the view of all members of the opposition in 1947. The leader of the C.C.F. took that stand, the leader of the Social Credit party took that stand, and their respective parties took that stand, as did the official opposition. Here we are in 1948. It is only a coincidence, perhaps; but, sir, when you have coincidence and coincidence and coincidence it ceases to be coincidence and becomes evidence of conspiracy. This is an endeavour on the part of the government to delude the farmer with regard to the so-called increase of the initial price which he received.

Mr. TUCKER: Are you against the bill?

Mr. HOWE: He is killing off forty minutes, that is all.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I beg your pardon?

Mr. HOWE: I say you are killing off forty minutes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am not really concerned with my right hon. friend's interruptions, because they are only indicative of the type of mentality that he developed in wartime and is trying to carry into the days of peace. If you will permit me to do so, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read the new paragraph 2:

2. Section 21 (1) (b) of the present act provides:

"Pay to producers selling and delivering wheat produced in the designated area to the board, at the time of delivery or at any time thereafter as may be agreed upon, a sum certain per bushel basis in store Fort William/Port Arthur or Vancouver to be fixed . . ."

Then the change is "from time to time by regulation of the governor in council in respect of wheat of grade No. 1 Manitoba northern."

What the government is endeavouring to do is to lead the western farmer to believe, now that he is beginning to appreciate the loss he suffered through receiving so much lower a price than that received by the farmers of the United States, that the government is now raising the initial price of the farmer's wheat in those years. What it is doing is taking moneys out of the participation fund, which belong to the farmer, and instead of paying him in bulk, applying it in certain years. The endeavour is to lead the farmer to believe that he is receiving a larger return. He is not receiving a larger return per bushel. All he is receiving is fifteen, twenty or twenty-five cents, whatever the amount is. He receives that, added on to the so-called initial price and deducted from what otherwise he would have received in participation payments. All it amounts to is this—

Mr. HOWE: A subtle argument.

Mr. GARDINER: You mean to say the farmer gets twenty cents and he does not know it?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Twenty cents he would have got whether this legislation passes or not. It is a fine move to give to the farmer what is coming to him. It represents the stand we of the official opposition took last year and particularly the stand taken by my leader, the hon. member for Souris and other members associated with him. The payment per bushel is not an additional amount per bushel payable to the farmer as an initial price. It is, in fact, a pre-distribution out of the participation account. The government knows how much it will pay; \$230 million, I believe, is the amount that it now holds to the credit of the Canadian farmer.

Mr. GARDINER: Everyone but the hon. member for Lake Centre always knew those facts.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It was known last year approximately what it would be. That being the case, what is the idea of waiting until after this bill is through to let the farmers know what they will get in 1945, 1946 and 1947? I can understand the argument that we do not know the amount which will be available in 1948 and 1949 and that some freedom must be given to permit of the fixation of price. That argument does not apply to the fixation of price for 1945, 1946 and 1947.

Mr. GARDINER: Fix it at the same time for 1948 and 1949. It is a five-year price; it is not a three-year price.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It will be a different price throughout the years; it will be different in 1945 and 1946.

Mr. GARDINER: It is the same every year; the same return every year of the five years by the time it is finished. It is a five-year payment.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, then, in my argument I was giving the government the benefit of the doubt. I said there was no reason why they should not carry out their policy in 1948 and 1949.

Mr. GARDINER: You have turned around now.

Mr. HOWE: He has changed his position.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I listen to my right hon. friend. Regardless of what he says I listen, and I do not keep up that continual grumble and growl. I say to him through you, Mr. Speaker, that his conduct is not parliamentary; it is not gentlemanly in parliament.

Mr. HOWE: Why are you worrying about my being a gentleman?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We on this side of the house want to see payments made to the farmers. We have advocated it. I agree with what the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) said this afternoon regarding conditions in the western provinces and the need by the farmers of the earliest possible distribution. He mentioned the Prairie Farm Assistance Act and how many farmers were in need and required that payment. That is true. In my experience I can say that whenever needy cases have been brought to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture in connection with that matter payments have been made. As regards the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, all over the province there are farmers who year by year had paid their one per cent levy; yet because of the position in which they find themselves, they being in not sufficiently large areas to come within the provisions of the act, they are being denied under the law the right to the prairie assistance payments. I ask the Minister of Agriculture, and I ask for the support of the hon. member for Rosthern in this regard: when amendments are being brought in, why not bring in an amendment to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act that, as far as possible and as far as practicable, will reduce the area within which qualification takes place, and as nearly as possible arrive at an individual basis in connection with the payment of the bonus? I know the difficulties in connection with the individual—

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Mr. GARDINER: The bill is on the order paper.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I want to thank the minister for that, because that is one thing—

Mr. GARDINER: No; the P.F.A. bill itself is on the order paper. I do not think it should be discussed in this debate.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, sir—

Mr. HOWE: Anything to take up the forty minutes.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: —is it not strange? The hon. member for Rosthern discussed it this afternoon and it was perfectly all right. Now I am out of order. We in the opposition want to be assured that the wheat board shall operate efficiently, carefully, not niggardly, but economically for the benefit of the farmer which shall assure him the best price, the largest possible return. We say, too, that it should not be used as an instrument of government policy whereby the farmer, in the midst of rising prices, has his price maintained at a level far too low, having regard to all the circumstances.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): I am glad to see that the water glasses have been drained so quickly on the other side of the house, and I hope the temperature has decreased a little on that side because I do not intend to take up very much time. In order that Social Crediters shall not be accused of holding up this legislation, legislation which we have asked for on many occasions during this session, I am going to state now on behalf of this group, that we are supporting this legislation, Bill No. 135. We may perhaps be accused of changing our minds from the stand we took two weeks ago. At that time we did approve the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) to divide the bill into three sections. We did that for one purpose, and one purpose only, namely, to speed the passage of the legislation.

Perhaps, if the government had been in a real hurry this legislation would have been introduced when we came here early in December. Then we could have dealt with it, instead of some of the other matters dealt with during the two weeks we were here in December; or perhaps we could have taken up some of the time to deal with this bill that we have used up on other matters of less importance since we came here on January 26; or perhaps better still the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) could have gone on the radio again on November 18. We remember very well that on November 17 He went on the radio and assessed or levied taxes on the

people of Canada without authority of parliament, and on the next night he might have gone on the radio and told the farmers of the prairie provinces that this amount would be paid to them, and that when parliament met we would pass the necessary legislation. That, however, was not done, and if the suggestion of the hon. member for Souris had been followed out I believe this legislation could have been on the statute books tonight and the western provinces given every opportunity to pass the necessary complementary legislation.

Our big difficulty now is to see that this interim payment is got out without any further delay. We remember that last fall, after the agreement with Britain was signed, in which it was agreed that \$2 a bushel would be paid for the 1948 crop, an announcement was made that there would be an additional interim payment. Later on we were told that the payment would run up possibly to thirty cents. Some people had it go as high as forty cents. Under present conditions I believe a payment of forty cents could be made, but up to the present time we have not been told what the payment will be.

I am going to suggest to the government that, in order to relieve distress in many parts of the prairie provinces, the farmers who were either hauled out or dried out last year be given their payments first as far as possible and then get the other payments out just as fast as it is possible to do so, because today many farmers in all sections of the prairie provinces are in dire need of this money which they have figured on for many months in order to get their crops in this spring.

Let nobody make the mistake that the farmers are getting money from the treasury of Canada, because this money belongs to the farmers of the prairie provinces, as well as many millions of dollars that are not in the fund at the present time. In many cases farmers are still paying interest on their debts which should have been discharged with these belated payments on their wheat.

When speaking on the 27th of last month the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) mentioned the too high interim payments that were made by the pools back in 1929. At page 1717 of *Hansard* we find:

We gave reasons which were referred to this afternoon by the hon. member for Swift Current, without drawing the conclusions which many of us have drawn on previous occasions.

I asked him whether there had been any pooling of oats and barley since 1932, and I might have asked whether there had been any pooling of wheat since 1932. The only reason why there has been no pooling of oats and barley since 1932 is that the wheat pools prior to 1932 made

the mistake of paying too high an initial payment and were not able to pay any participation.

In case that should go out without contradiction, I am quite satisfied that the pools did pay an initial payment which was too high for the conditions that followed afterwards, but while that initial payment was less than 90 cents a bushel, 87½ cents I believe, it must be remembered that the price of wheat was up to \$1.50 a bushel during that fall of 1929. Had the grain trade and others interested had their way, the initial payment would have been much higher than 90 cents a bushel. But the officers of the pool, being sound administrators then as they are today, kept the initial price down; and it was the fault of the government in office at that time, in allowing a man-made depression to come about and bring down the price of grain and other farm produce, which made the initial payment too high. So that the government instead of the pool must accept full responsibility for losses which were sustained by the pool at that time. I might say, in connection with that matter, that grain men who had been in the grain business all their lives on the grain exchange went broke on that occasion. They were caught in a trap which they perhaps had helped to set.

Going on a little farther and dealing with prices, the Minister of Agriculture had this to say at page 1720 of *Hansard*:

A very considerable part of it will never be paid back.

That is dealing with the money which was lent to various countries in order that they might be able to buy our wheat and other produce. To continue:

And to the extent to which it is not paid back, in so far as it relates to wheat, the money which was paid to the farmer for the wheat is a charge on all the people of Canada. That money goes to the farmer, and I think it ought to go to him. As we go along with this plan of marketing and make the payments which are provided for in the bill as it is now before the house, we shall be in a position to show in due course that the farmer will have obtained more money, on an average annually, than ever before through his payments based upon \$2 for next year, the \$1.55 he has obtained from Britain in the three years that have gone by, and based upon the wheat which has been sold outside of Britain at higher prices running up as high as \$3.40 a bushel, and out of a negotiated price from Britain in 1949. Out of all these the farmer will have obtained more money for his wheat than he could have obtained under any other system.

I do not think it is necessary for me to read any farther there, because I believe that the minister has tried to draw a red herring across the trail, not only in this instance but when

he was dealing with the price of wheat in the United States. In Canada we have an entirely different situation from that which prevails in the United States. What we must compare is the price that we have received on an average on the British contract and the price of class 2 wheat that is sold by the wheat board, which, as the minister has said, on some occasions ran as high as \$3.40 a bushel.

Mr. GARDINER: Pure nonsense.

Mr. FAIR: It is a pure loss in dollars and cents to the farmers, regardless of what the Minister of Agriculture may say.

Mr. GARDINER: Pure nonsense.

Mr. FAIR: I do not think there is any mistake about it, and the farmers are fully cognizant of that fact. So that in my opinion, and I have expressed it on many occasions before, the government has made a mistake as far as the farmers are concerned; and I again request the government to make good out of the consolidated revenue fund sufficient money to pay the farmers the difference between the price received from Britain and the world market price or the price of class 2 wheat, I do not care which you call it.

In addition to that, there is the matter of the subsidies borne entirely by the Canadian farmers in order to give the people of Canada cheap bread and also the subsidies that have been borne again by the Canadian farmers when wheat was sold at a controlled price of \$1.55 a bushel in all export markets of the world.

We are in favour of coarse grains being marketed through the wheat board and of going just a little bit farther than the bill itself goes. We should like to see rye also included. That may not perhaps suit some of our friends in Winnipeg, but that does not make any difference. They have had their innings and now it is about time that farmers received that to which they are properly entitled.

I stated at the beginning that we would support this legislation. We shall not hold it up, because we believe it is necessary that this bill be passed without further delay so that the provinces may pass the necessary complementary legislation. I am glad to be able to state that the government of Alberta is quite ready to pass the necessary complementary legislation provided that the provinces agree that the interests of the prairie farmers are fully protected; that is to say that, among other things, we do not have a ceiling on the price of our coarse grain, and there are some other conditions which may be named later. The government of Alberta

[Mr. Fair.]

expects to finish its work within the next two weeks. This will mean that they should have from this government some clear-cut indication of what is required of them by way of legislation. It will be found that all possible co-operation will be received from the Alberta government at as early a day as it is made possible for them to give it.

I do not think it is necessary for me to speak longer. I have given the house our stand, and I hope that this legislation will be passed without much further time being taken up in discussion.

Mr. L. A. MUTCH (Winnipeg South): I hope the house will not misunderstand it, Mr. Speaker, if I do not enter into the Saskatchewan election campaign which we have been having most of the afternoon and a good deal of the evening. In the little time that I shall talk, I shall try to substitute common sense for eloquence and invective. Before this bill goes to second reading, I wish to express my view and the view which I conceive to be that of a good many Canadians on part of this bill before we are required to vote on the principle of it.

Before someone suggests to me that there is something unique about a member representing a city constituency, as I do, entering into a discussion of this kind, I should like to say that my own family have been farming the same farm in Manitoba since long before any of the hon. members of either the C.C.F. or the Social Credit party were born. That farm is still being maintained. Consequently, although I for various reasons have not had the physical experience of farming to any extent, I have been closely associated with it. I have spent my life in a province where farming is the main industry. I am one of those who knows what many members of this house sometimes seem to forget, namely that everybody in the Dominion of Canada, whether he or she knows it or not, is in the wheat business.

I should like to say one congratulatory thing to the modern "Saul" of Souris. Somewhere between the time of the by-election in Portage la Prairie and December of last year the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) must have seen a great light. I am greatly encouraged, in the point of view that I have, to recognize that fact; because it indicates to me that for others, not only on the side of the house toward which I am looking but on the side of the house on which I sit, there is still hope for those who have lost sight of the realities of this discussion in a spate of invective and political adventuring.

I hardly need to say, in view of previous comments of my own in this parliament, that with respect to the pension part of the bill I have no objection. With respect to the payment of these moneys which have accrued to the credit of the farmers who created them I have no objection. My objection stems solely from my conviction that there is something fundamentally wrong and fundamentally dangerous—I almost said something insincere—about the third part of this bill which refers to the bringing of the marketing of coarse grains, oats and barley, under the wheat board. I am not an opponent of the freedom of the individual engaged in agriculture, or any other means of earning his living, from what is a sheer monopoly. It is the monopoly aspect of the wheat board to which I object. As a member of this house and as a citizen of Canada I would have no objection to this part of the legislation if there existed in Canada today, as there once did, the opportunity for the farmer to market his grain either through the wheat board or through the trade.

During the time I have been in this house I have listened to a great deal of nonsense with respect to the marketing of wheat through the trade, the free marketing of wheat. Perhaps the silliest of all the arguments I have heard—and most of them were silly—are those based on the oft-repeated suggestion that the system of marketing grain through the exchange and its facilities was a costly thing for the farmers of western Canada. It is useless to establish it, I suppose, because people have said the other thing so often they have come to believe it themselves, but it can be established and indeed has been established over and over again that no other primary product produced in this country—and I place emphasis on those words "in this country"—has ever been handled at such low cost as was the grain on the prairies when it was handled through the facilities of the exchange.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MUTCH: I know hon. members challenge that statement, and I would not be surprised if some of them do not believe it is true, but it has been established over and over again. The trouble is that the mentality of some of those who retain their popularity, not to say their positions, by constant agitation is similar to that of some persons I ran into in connection with the inquiry into the profits from the canteens during the last war. It is well known to people generally that com-

modities carried in those canteens were handled at a very narrow margin of profit, and when we came across an item of something like a quarter of a million dollars from the sale of Coca Cola there was a howl and a question as to why that commodity should not have been sold to the troops at a price which would not have brought that kind of profit. When we came to examine it, however, we found that the profit was a quarter of a cent a bottle, and we have no coinage in this country as small as that. It was found that the profit of a quarter of a million dollars arose from the fact that a million bottles of Coca Cola had been sold. A good deal of the unthinking criticism of the legitimate profits which were made from marketing through the grain exchange is the result of that same sort of thinking.

Mr. BENTLEY: The hon. member is making assertions. Why does he not support them with figures? He has none?

Mr. MUTCH: Oh, yes, there are figures; but let me remind my hon. friend that, while figures do not lie, very often people who use them do; and I am trying to follow what I think is the proper procedure on second reading of a bill, by dealing with the principle of the bill itself.

Mr. BENTLEY: I was being kind when I said you were making assertions.

Mr. MUTCH: I appreciate the unfailing courtesy of my hon. friend. However, my objection to this legislation is not based primarily on the effect it will have on a specific institution but on the effect I believe it will come to have on the whole political life of this dominion. I am aware, as some other hon. members who have spoken in this debate appear to have been aware, that the bringing into operation of this legislation is another step, perhaps almost the last step, in creating a state marketing monopoly, which to my mind is socialism gone crazy. It means simply the final and perhaps permanent division of the two branches of agriculture in this country, namely the producers on the prairies and the feeders in central Canada and on the Pacific coast.

I have been here long enough, Mr. Speaker, to realize what happens when a government gets into the position of having to give political consideration to decisions which have to be made. I would not be surprised or perhaps very indignant if someone should rise and try to justify the introduction of legislation to the disadvantage of the western farmer and to the advantage of the eastern farmer simply

and solely, as far as the party I normally support is concerned, on the basis of giving consideration where consideration is received. But I do not consider that a healthy situation, and for that reason I do not want to see opportunities for that sort of thing multiply.

Politically I am perfectly certain that if we resort to absolute state trading, through a board to handle all grain in the country, we shall not only put the farming community into economic slavery, which is the first tragedy, but make farm prices a political football, the results of which action can be nothing but disastrous for generations to come. This demand for the inclusion of coarse grains under the wheat board is not primarily an attack upon one institution. It is a thoughtful, deliberate attack on the very principle of free enterprise itself. Many of those who attack the marketing of grain through the trade are at the same time the most vocal advocates of free enterprise with respect to other commodities and other businesses. But it does not require a great deal of imagination on the part of any hon. member to realize that all the arguments which can be advanced for the control of cereal grains, because they are foods, can be extended with equal facility to the control of fuel, of shelter and of clothing. In a country with a climate such as we have, even if everyone has enough to eat at a price they can afford to pay, there still remain the twin problems—and not inconsiderable problems at that—of fuel and shelter.

This, then, sir, is a disguised attack on the principle of free enterprise itself. If we can successfully attack free enterprise in its handling of one of the primary products of this country, perhaps its greatest product, it is then but a simple and logical step, and part of the planned procedure, to bring the whole economy of this country under the socialist concept.

So, primarily for the reasons I have stated, without eloquence as I said in the beginning, on this occasion and on each and every other occasion that presents itself I do not propose, either in this house or out of it, to be a party to any piece of legislation which will give the impression that the elected representatives of our people believe in state control of marketing.

As I have said, I have been here and have listened to these debates now for, I think, fifteen sessions. The volume is building up. I say, as I said in an interjection a little while ago when the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) was speaking, that I question seriously whether the house, or any member of it, has a mandate from his constituency or from the country as a whole to say there is a demand

[Mr. Mutch.]

from a majority, or even a considerable minority demand, for the inclusion of coarse grains under the wheat board.

I am perfectly well aware that members on both sides of the house are very glib at quoting officers and officials of various farm organizations throughout the country. But I venture to say, on my responsibility as a member, that, so far as I am concerned, I do not believe that organized farm organizations speak for more than forty per cent of the farmers in any part of this country. And on the average I should think it would be considerably less than that.

I know sections of western Canada where there are farm organizations. Many of these have been little local groups belonging to various farm organizations that have perpetuated themselves, in my memory over a period of ten and fifteen years. These little groups have been in communities of six hundred or seven hundred farmers. They have met every year, and in each year they have passed resolutions in the name of all local farmers. I challenge the members for many of those constituencies or communities to show me twenty per cent of the farmers in their constituencies who know who the officers are.

Generally speaking, when in the House of Commons we want to do something to which there is opposition from farmers we are inclined to say that organization heads are the farm leaders, to claim that some gentleman from the Ottawa valley speaks for the farmers of western Canada. I do not know about other farmers, but I know something of the farmers in western Canada, and in these matters a great many are inarticulate, except at the ballot box.

There is only one more thing I wish to say, and that is this, that if something is wrong in principle, as I can conceive this to be, I do not think it is a defence of that particular wrong principle to say that this government will only enable another government to do something, and to admit, by so evading the responsibility, that there is a possibility that it will not be approved. Nor is it good enough to say the farmers and others in those provinces will have an opportunity, when election day comes along, to express their pleasure or displeasure with the provincial government.

If it is wrong in principle as I conceive it to be, then I do not think it is any better when a provincial and a federal government get together to apply that wrong principle than it is when either of them does it individually.

I could—indeed perhaps I should—detain the house for a little while and make a statement in answer to some of the specific charges which have been levelled, not against the principle of open marketing in the matter of grain, but the childish and often senseless repetition of charges against the Winnipeg grain exchange; not just because it happens to be in Winnipeg, because there are other exchanges. The same kind of people level the same kind of charges wherever free marketing flourishes. But I cannot see that it would do any good to discuss this. When you are facing a hurricane it is of little use to whistle. There is at the present time, I know, a campaign of thoughtless, inspired and, in some instances, malicious misinformation in the name of education going on against the Winnipeg grain exchange.

I think the responsibility to meet with that and to confound it and refute it is largely the responsibility of those who are most affected. I know this, that nothing I can say has not already been brought out over and over again in investigations and royal commissions. There is very little that anyone can say that is not known personally to those who from time to time, and for reasons which one must leave to their own conscience, repeat, in season and out of season, without shadow of justification and without even a sense of responsibility, these attacks on the grain trade; who attack men who, by their efforts, by their skills and the investment of their money, have served the public of western Canada to a degree which is appreciated more than many members of this house seem to realize, by those who have been the beneficiaries of their service. If in the not too distant future the wave or wind of discontent with the kind of tripe which is being levelled against free enterprise, specifically in the grain trade, should blow away from the picture some of those who have been actually carrying on this crusade, tilting at figures which are a figment of their own imagination, then they should not be too much surprised.

Mr. C. C. MILLER (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I shall not delay the house long, because there is not much time left in which to delay it. There are, however, some points in connection with the bill about which I should like to speak for a few minutes.

I did speak on the resolution, but since the resolution has passed I have received some additional information which has caused me to make some additional remarks relative to the pension amendment proposed in this bill.

The parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been good enough

to give me in advance the answers to a question I put on the order paper in connection with salaries, and other information relevant to the employees of the wheat board. The reason obviously that question was asked was to give some idea of the number of employees and the amount of money they were being paid by way of remuneration, so that we could determine for ourselves and make up our own minds as to whether or not we thought that those employees of the wheat board should be pensioned, or that a pension fund should be provided for them at the expense, to some extent at least, of growers of grain in the western provinces.

The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) discussed this matter more or less briefly this afternoon. The first question I asked in my question on the order paper was as to the number of employees, including the members of the Canadian wheat board, as at December 31, 1947. The answer to that question was 676. That 676 included the members of the board. The second question was:

Is the consolidated revenue charged with the payment of salaries or wages of (a) the board; (b) the board's employees?

The answer to that was no. Therefore the salaries or wages of these employees are obviously paid as part of the operating expenses out of the proceeds of the sale of the farmers' grain. I am not taking particular issue with that. There is one small exception to that rule, but it is not important for the purpose of this debate. Then, as the hon. member for Souris stated, there were these various employees receiving these varying amounts of remuneration, beginning at \$1,000 per annum. The following figures will show the rates of salaries, and the numbers of employees receiving those salaries:

Under \$1,000	103
1,000 to \$2,000	388
2,000 to 3,000	122
3,000 to 4,000	26
4,000 to 5,000	6
5,000 to 6,000	7
6,000 to 7,000	2
7,000 to 8,000	7
8,000 to 9,000	2
9,000 to 10,000	1
10,000 to 15,000	11
15,000 and over	1

In addition to that, there were twenty-eight part-time employees at remunerations ranging from \$660 to \$1,560 per annum.

The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) did not deal any too clearly with this question of pensions. He gave it his blessing to some extent, but not too definitely or in too clear language. I wonder if the hon. member for Rosthern is prepared to say definitely

and without equivocation that he is in favour of the farmers of Saskatchewan, from the drouth area if you will, having to subscribe or permitting to be subscribed on their behalf certain moneys into a pension fund to provide pensions for eleven men who are getting from \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year?

Mr. TUCKER: I am going to vote for the bill.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member is going to vote for the bill because he dares not vote against it. There is no bill that this government would bring in that the hon. member for Rosthern would vote against.

Mr. TUCKER: They are a pretty good government.

Mr. MILLER: On top of that, the hon. member for Rosthern based a lot of his argument upon what was contained in the brief which was presented by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture to the government and from which he read at some length. I did not hear the hon. member for Rosthern read anything from that brief to the effect that the farmers who belonged to the C.F.A. wanted the wheat board to pay money out of their funds to provide pensions for employees already getting from \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year. My hearing may be faulty, but I have no recollection of having heard that read from the C.F.A. brief. I doubt if at any time any organization of farmers, including the C.F.A., ever asked the government to bring in an amendment to the act to provide pensions for men already getting from \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year.

Mr. GARDINER: That is true of all our deputies.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member for Rosthern skated around that idea. So far as the farmers of western Canada are concerned, he was skating on thin ice. I doubt if the hon. member for Rosthern because of his build, either as a member of this house or as the leader of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan, should go too near thin ice.

Mr. TUCKER: He did not skate around as much as you did in regard to saying in the by-election that you would close the grain exchange when you are saying now you want to leave it open.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member cannot get me on that. Above all hon. members of this house I have been consistent in my stand, both as to the wheat board and as to the grain exchange. I said it in that famous by-election to which he referred—if it is [Mr. Miller.]

famous, and I hope it is not infamous—at meetings where there were grain exchange men and at meetings where there were farmers. I can say what I believe on that score at any time and at any place without having to change face.

Mr. HOWE: What did you say?

Mr. SINNOTT: Tell us what you said?

Mr. MILLER: I know the hon. member for Springfield is not really worrying about any answer I might make that might be taken down in evidence and used against me in my trial at the next election. I know he is not worrying about anything like that. I know he is sincere in wanting to know how I stand. I imagine how I stand would make an awful lot of difference to the way in which the hon. member for Springfield will vote on this amendment.

Mr. SINNOTT: You do not answer the question.

Mr. MILLER: There has been a lot of talk here about delay.

Mr. SINNOTT: You are doing considerable skating yourself.

Mr. MILLER: Yes, I played hockey once.

Mr. TUCKER: You are a better skater than I.

Mr. MILLER: If I were as big as the hon. member for Rosthern I would still be playing hockey.

Mr. SINNOTT: You are almost as good as Barbara Ann.

Mr. BENTLEY: Neither one of you are easier to look at.

Mr. MILLER: Let me refer to this question of delay which has been referred to so often today, particularly by the hon. member for Rosthern. No matter how loudly the hon. member for Rosthern may talk, there can be no accusation that hon. members on this side of the house are responsible in any way for that delay. The cure for the delay is simple. All that the government had to do was to bring in a bill at the outset providing for the payment of these funds and the funds would have been paid out long before this. But no, they did not bring in a bill providing solely for that. If they had had any foresight at all they must have known that that would have met with the unanimous approval of this house. But no, they mixed it up with all kinds of other things. If they did not know that the hon. members of this house would be opposed to some parts of this bill, then they

were entirely lacking in foresight. They cannot by reason of that lack of foresight blame us or any other party on this side of the house for any delay.

Mr. KNOWLES: Question.

Mr. MILLER: What question? I want to say something about the amendments relative to coarse grain. As far as I can understand, we have been arguing all day as if the issue were just the simple one of whether coarse grains were to be under the wheat board or whether they were not. I submit that that is not the issue before the house. There is nothing in this amendment to warrant us in assuming for one minute that some people on one side are in favour of putting coarse grains under the supervision of the wheat board and that other people in other parts of the house are opposed to that principle.

I suggest that the government do not know themselves whether they intend to have the wheat board handle coarse grains this year, next year or ten years from now. No member of the government can rise in his place and say that, even if they had all the enabling legislation in the world, they would put coarse grains under the jurisdiction of the wheat board tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLES: What would you do?

Mr. SINNOTT: The machinery is all set up.

Mr. MILLER: I suggest that they do not believe they will ever have to face that issue. I submit that the government are playing both ends against the middle on this question. There is not a law officer or a minister of the crown who can tell us, even if the proposed amendment were put into effect, whether the putting of coarse grains under the jurisdiction of the wheat board is or is not constitutional. They have not approached it in a manner that would lead us to believe in confidence that the government ever had or ever will have any intention of putting coarse grains under the jurisdiction of that board. I imagine that at this day and at this sitting the government do not themselves know that they will bring coarse grains under the operations of the wheat board act.

But suppose the government are acting in the best of faith. Suppose they are genuinely anxious to have coarse grains put under the jurisdiction of the wheat board, maybe not this year but perhaps next year. Let me answer some of the arguments of the hon. member for Rosthern with regard to delay. There is not a single, solitary cabinet minister who would stand in his place for one minute and try to convince this house that he believed

that, no matter what the house does with these amendments, they could by any possible stretch of the imagination get the legislation through the various legislatures of this dominion in time to put this in operation this year.

Mr. TUCKER: Why not give them a chance?

Mr. MILLER: It is all right to give them a chance, but the hon. member for Rosthern today accused hon. members on this side of delaying it until the legislatures would be no longer sitting. If the government were in earnest and really wanted to get this legislation through, I know the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) is rather efficient in getting done what he really desires to have done, and I would wager that he would have had this all lined up last summer. He would have known exactly whether it was constitutional or not. He would have had conferences with the various legislatures. The various ministers of agriculture were here last December. Was there any talk of enabling legislation at that time? If so, why is the premier of Saskatchewan now writing to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) to find out what kind of enabling legislation is required by this government from the provinces?

Are the ministers of the crown prepared to tell us tonight whether they do or do not require enabling legislation from the provinces of Quebec and Ontario? The Minister of Trade and Commerce suggested that it might possibly be the situation that they might have to get enabling legislation not merely from the western provincial legislatures but also from the legislatures of the east where the grain would be sold. I suggest that the Minister of Trade and Commerce tonight does not know whether he has to get enabling legislation from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec or perhaps even from the maritime provinces before any such coarse grains can be brought under the operation of the wheat board act.

I believe that all that is going on here now is a little by-play, a little story to make those who want coarse grains under the operation of the wheat board believe that this government is doing all it can to that end, while at the same time it is in a position to say to those who are opposed to that proceeding, "Well, we have not done anything about it, have we?"

They are getting themselves into the glorious position of being able to play both ends against the middle. We have a wheat board. One of my colleagues made the suggestion

that the Minister of Trade and Commerce dominates the wheat policy of the country and, in effect, actually runs the board. Nevertheless, both the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Agriculture do, at least on occasion, call in members of that board and members of their advisory committee to talk these matters over and perhaps advise the ministry on the course of action. I do not say that the ministry always take their advice, or are bound to take their advice, but it would be interesting to know whether that advisory board, or council, or whatever it is, or the wheat board, have ever advised the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the wheat board wanted to handle coarse grains.

Mr. KNOWLES: What would you advise?

Mr. MILLER: I am not in the position of advising. It may not be long, but not yet. When, however, that time comes—

Mr. HOWE: You will be out of the house, probably.

Mr. MILLER: I would not wonder; but when that time comes, when we are in the position of advising, we shall never come into the House of Commons with a half-baked measure such as has been brought before us and which we are asked to accept now.

Mr. KNOWLES: You will probably do it by order in council.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is very good at jibing in on these things and I suppose that is fair enough, because I have been doing it to him.

Mr. KNOWLES: I want to find out where you stand on the question.

Mr. MILLER: When the time comes that there is a question I will vote. I never hide under a bushel.

Mr. TUCKER: Why don't you let us vote, then?

Mr. MILLER: The trouble with the hon. member for Rosthern is that he has been standing up and shouting and yelling in this house so long that he thinks, when he has made the welkin ring and this hall reverberate, all wisdom has been given the house and no one else has anything left to say. I say it to you, Mr. Speaker, that if any member of this cabinet, responsible for carrying this legislation into effect, were sincere in his purpose, in wanting to have coarse grains put under the operation of the board, the logical and natural thing to do, as the hon. member for

[Mr. Miller.]

Melfort said, was to have called the representatives of the provinces together long before this date and have the matter put into some sort of shape so that they could come here and tell us whether it was constitutional.

Mr. GARDINER: Might I answer the suggestion made to me a moment ago? The question was discussed last December at the dominion-provincial conference. It was discussed at the national meeting of the Canadian federation and was reported in the press. If my hon. friend followed these things he would know it was discussed.

Mr. MILLER: I know it was discussed.

Mr. TUCKER: Just ten minutes to go.

Mr. MILLER: I want to revert to another matter now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. MILLER: This is not bad initiation; I am rather enjoying it. I want to turn now to one other angle which perhaps relates at least remotely to the amendment we have before the house, and I wish to comment on the almost unique argument made in this house not so long ago by the Minister of Agriculture. I know we have been hammering away on this side of the house against the government, urging that farmers should not be asked to carry the whole load and bear the whole of what we claim to have been lost in connection with the sale under the British agreement. For the first time in my recollection, the Minister of Agriculture, not many days ago, advanced what I would call a unique argument. He said the loans would not be paid anyway—

Mr. GARDINER: A considerable part of it.

Mr. MILLER: —and therefore the farmer was not carrying the load; that part of it would be carried by the general taxpayer of the country.

Mr. GARDINER: I made the same statement in the discussion of this same bill a year ago.

Mr. MILLER: Well, the Minister of Agriculture used to get up and make a speech almost every time we turned around last year, and he will forgive me if I do not remember every speech that he has made. Surely the minister will admit that the argument was unique, if he will not admit that this is the first time he has made it. I hope he will admit that it is unique. First of all, the Minister of Finance does not agree with the Minister of Agriculture. He says that, except for setting up a reserve to the extent of \$25,000,000 a year, to take care of

loans, the money will be got back. The former minister of trade and commerce, now the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. MacKinnon), used to gloat over his tremendous exports, and when he "blew" about exports we presumed that he was gloating about exports he was getting money for. It does not take a very wise man to figure that if you have ten, or one hundred, or six hundred million bushels of wheat, and you wish to have a big export trade, provided that you are ready to give it away, you can mighty soon do a big business. I could do the same thing in the automobile business if I had a bunch of automobiles and wanted to give them away; I could have a tremendous turnover. That is the position the minister is getting into.

Mr. MITCHELL: Are you objecting to coming to the assistance of the British people?

Mr. HOWE: He will not answer that.

Mr. MILLER: When a minister asks that question of a member I submit in all fairness that the implication is not a very good one.

Mr. MITCHELL: You brought it up.

Mr. MILLER: Would the minister suggest for a moment that I am not in favour of giving aid to the British?

Mr. MITCHELL: Why raise the question?

Mr. MILLER: That is not the argument at all. I have made myself clear on the record many times—

Mr. SINNOTT: You cannot skate around that one.

Mr. MILLER: I often wonder, when the hon. member for Springfield interjects such remarks, how, before he was elected in 1945, this house ever got along without his interjected effervescent wisdom.

Mr. SINNOTT: It had effect anyway.

Mr. MILLER: Surely I can draw this conclusion, from what the Minister of Agriculture said, which he now says he said twice, namely, that everybody has to pay on this wheat because they will have to pay the money that the British will not pay back. If that is his premise, then I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that at long last he has admitted the argument that we have been making here, that there is discrimination against the farmer and that the farmer is carrying an unfair portion of this load.

May I refer to coarse grains again? If the minister who is charged with the progress of this bill through the House of Commons is in earnest—he is a man of honour—and will rise in his place in this house and tell us without

equivocation, tell us beyond question that he will see that an order in council is passed if the necessary enabling legislation is brought in; if he will rise in his place and tell us deliberately in no uncertain terms what provinces he thinks he must have enabling legislation from; if he will tell us when he expects to have enabling legislation; if he will tell us at least how long he expects it will take them to pass that enabling legislation, then we shall have a lot more to go on than we now have.

Mr. KNOWLES: We know where you stand.

Mr. HOWE: If you sit down I might tell you.

Mr. MILLER: I shall give you the chance if you will tell me, but I do not surrender my place; I will let you answer the question.

Mr. HOWE: If I speak now I will close the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER: The minister says he will answer my question and I have given him the chance. He would not be closing the debate.

Mr. HOWE: I would be.

Mr. MILLER: The minister did not start it and I do not think he will close it.

Mr. HOWE: I will close it.

Mr. MILLER: If we pass this bill, undoubtedly as the years go by, as they will, as the house meets from year to year, as it will, we shall have to listen endlessly in this House of Commons, unless we have an election in the meantime, to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Agriculture from time to time answer my hon. friends to the left and try to explain to them, if they can, why they have not passed an order in council putting coarse grains under the operation or supervision of the wheat board, and I shall prophesy—

Mr. TUCKER: Why not put them in that position?

Mr. MILLER: I shall prophesy, again, Mr. Speaker, that, as time goes on, another excuse will be given. I shall give you the excuse in advance so that it will be on *Hansard*. The excuse will be, well, we have done all we could; we passed the bill. We took power by order in council and we got an enabling bill from Saskatchewan and Manitoba and from some of the other provinces; but we have not yet been able to complete our negotiations with the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec and we have not made up our minds yet whether we have to get enabling

legislation from New Brunswick and perhaps British Columbia because they feed chickens, and therefore we do not know exactly where we are. That will go on and on.

Mr. KNOWLES: On and on.

Mr. MILLER: If I did not go on and on it would be eleven o'clock.

Mr. KNOWLES: Question.

Mr. HOWE: Question.

Mr. MILLER: I want to deal with one other amendment that is mentioned in the bill.

Mr. MacINNIS: You will hardly have time.

Mr. MILLER: I want to speak of one other amendment that is in the proposed bill—

Mr. TUCKER: Three minutes to go.

Mr. MILLER: I refer to the amendment relating to—

Mr. KNOWLES: I rise to a point of order. It is out of order on second reading of a bill to deal with sections of a bill.

Mr. GRAYDON: An echo of the Liberal party.

Mr. MILLER: I had not got that far. I will speak of it in general terms. I think the objection was well taken, Mr. Speaker. It is an amendment that has been entirely disregarded in this house, or at least it has been too lightly regarded. There has been too little explanation in respect of it. The amendment relates to the control of the transportation of wheat products from one province to another, I presume. The only comment I heard on that amendment in the house was made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think he referred to flour. If coarse grains come under the operation of the wheat board I presume that the amendment which has been proposed is wide enough to cover all products of oats

and barley, and I suppose there will be a bit of a problem to a Scotsman like myself on the question of transporting from one province to another oatmeal to make porridge.

When the minister does close the debate I wonder if he would refer to that. It may not be an important matter, but perhaps it should be in here so that we do not overlook anything. When the minister closes the debate he should give us a list of the products that he thinks will be covered by the amendment which relates to wheat products and the other possible oat and barley products. I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Mr. Miller the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ST. LAURENT: On Monday we should like to take up, first, the resolution standing in the name of the Minister of Finance, which is No. 15 on today's order paper. It is one that I am told is not controversial. It has to do with the refunding of certain debentures of the New Westminster harbour commission, and it is something which has to be done before the end of the fiscal year. It is hoped that it may take only a very few minutes to introduce the bill. Hon. members will probably wish to have the terms of the bill for the purpose of any debate, should any debate be desired.

Then the Minister of Justice will proceed with second reading of the bill to provide that certain orders and regulations of the governor in council be extended for a limited period. If that is disposed of, the Minister of Agriculture will propose the resolution which is No. 8 on the order paper of today, to bring in a measure to amend the Agricultural Products Act.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.