

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
35th Day

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

The House met at three o'clock p.m.

FIVE-YEAR POOL SETTLEMENT

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 20, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thair:

That this Assembly endorses the resolution passed at a joint meeting of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and the Executive of the Western Agricultural Conference held in Regina on Wednesday, March 7, 1951, as follows:

“That the Government of Canada be asked to pay on the five-year pool settlement at least \$48,000,000 as a return of the subsidy paid by producers on domestic wheat, plus a further substantial payment in addition to the \$65,000,000 token payment already announced in consideration of the “have-regard-to” clause of the Canada-U.K. Agreement.”

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the House is now discussing the motion which was moved by the member from Lumsden and seconded by the member from Bengough (Mr. Brown).

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any matter that is of more paramount interest to the wheat growers of Western Canada, and to the farmers in Saskatchewan in particular, than this question of the final settlement on the wheat delivered to the five-year pool.

It was, therefore, a matter of very bitter disappointment to the farmers all over the west, when, on March 2nd, the Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Mr. St. Laurent, announced that the final settlement would be only 8.3 cents per bushel. Farmers, over the last two or three years, by virtue of statements made by Federal Cabinet Ministers and by other persons in public life, had good reason to believe that they would receive a very considerably larger amount than 8.3 cents per bushel. One of the Pools, or probably two of the Pools, had asked for 25 cents a bushel, and I believe the Saskatchewan Pool had asked for 15 cents a bushel, as a final minimum settlement — at least that amount; and therefore, the 8.3 cents has come as somewhat of a shock to the farmers on the prairies.

Ever since that announcement was made, speakers for the Liberal party have been trying to find a scapegoat on whom they can lay the blame. Some of the time it has been the British Government; they are even in such desperate straits that they picked on my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIntosh). They now are beginning to blame the large number of

March 21, 1951

eastern members in the House of Commons and it was even hinted, yesterday, that if we ask too much or are too vehement in our demands, we are liable to lose the whole idea of orderly marketing and the Wheat Board.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at this whole question of the five-year pool and see what it means, and see if we can assess what the wheat growers of Western Canada are entitled to as a final payment. Let us begin by seeing, first of all, what wheat we are talking about. The wheat we are talking about is the wheat delivered from 1945 to 1949, inclusive — about 1400 million bushels of wheat; and within that period of time, 1344 million of it was sold. I am going to give the breakdown so that we can get these various categories of wheat clearly in mind. First of all, 208 million bushels were sold to all countries, prior to the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement of 1945, which started in 1945-46; that wheat was sold at \$1.55 a bushel, basis in store Fort William or Vancouver for No. 1 Northern. Then there was 631,500,000 bushels sold to the United Kingdom, under the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement. Now, in the first two crop years, 1946 and 1947, 339 million bushels were sold at \$1.55 a bushel. In the last two years, 292 million bushels were sold at \$2.00 a bushel. If you take the average for the four years, the farmers received \$1.76 a bushel, No. 1 Northern, basis Fort William.

Then 196 million bushels were sold, which is usually called the Class 2 wheat, to other countries, subsequent to the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement, and this was sold at an average of \$2.36 per bushel. And then 56 million bushels were sold to countries other than the United Kingdom under the International Wheat Agreement. Of that amount, 15 million bushels were sold at \$1.80 and 41 million bushels at \$1.98, making a weighted average of \$1.93 a bushel. In this same 5-year period we are discussing, 251 million bushels were sold on the domestic market, at a weighted average of \$1.68 per bushel. That accounts for the 1344 million bushels of wheat sold on that five-year pool.

I want to draw attention, first of all, to the fact that the amount sold under the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement was 631,500,000 bushels — or somewhat less than half of the total amount going into the five-year pool. Now most of the discussion with reference to final payment has centred around the whole question of the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, it might be well if I took just a few moments to say something about this Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement.

First of all, I want to point out (as was pointed out yesterday) that all political parties in Canada supported this agreement. Let there be no attempt now, as some people are trying to do, to say that they never were in favour of bulk trading and long-term agreements. Every political party in Canada voted for that agreement. It is true that there were some differences of opinion, and I shall deal with those later, and there were some questions raised as to procedure and as to a different arrangement with regard to prices, but on the basic principle of bulk trading with a guaranteed price over a long period of time, that was unanimously accepted by all political parties in the House of Commons. I want to make it abundantly clear here and now, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of any controversy there has been with regard to the final settlement, the C.C.F. Party is unalterably on record as being in favour now, as we were then, of bulk trading and guaranteed

prices by long-term contract. We still believe that that is the best way to market the farmers' wheat. We believe that if the open market, the speculative market, was still to prevail, that the farmer would not even be getting as good a deal as he is getting under the agreement. We have not any doubt at all that, if we are going to have stability for agriculture, that stability must depend on long-term contracts and guaranteed prices.

Now there are reasons why it has not worked out as it should have worked out, and that I shall come to in a moment; but with the principle of orderly marketing, bulk trading and long-term contracts with guaranteed prices, we are in favour of it — although I must say this, Mr. Speaker, that the spectacle of what has happened in Ottawa, in the last few weeks, the attempt to make this whole question a political football, the attempt to lay the blame on another government that cannot speak for itself, has done a great deal to impair, has probably done irreparable damage to, the confidence that many people had in the principle of orderly marketing, bulk trading and long-term agreements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what were the terms of this Agreement? Most members are familiar with them; but just to refresh everyone's memory, I may remind them that, for the first two years, the British Government was to take 160 million bushels in each of the two years — that is, 320 million bushels in the first two years. The next two years they were to take 140 million bushels each year — that is 280 million. They were to take 600 million bushels. As a matter of fact, as I have already shown, they took 631,500,000 bushels, and I want to point out, as the Minister of Agriculture did when this question was in the House in 1946, that this represented from 50 to 70 million bushels a year more than Great Britain had taken from us normally in the pre-war years. In other words, as a result of this agreement, we sold to Great Britain anywhere from 200 to 280 million bushels more than we would have sold in all probability, had pre-war conditions continued with respect to demand for Canadian wheat from the British market.

Now, with reference to price. The first two years of the contract, we were to sell this 320 million bushels of wheat to Great Britain at a price of \$1.55 a bushel, basis Fort William; the third year we were to receive \$1.25 a bushel, and not, as I understood my hon. friend, the Leader of Opposition to quote, yesterday, "not less than \$1.25" — but \$1.25 was the price stated in the Agreement.

Mr. Tucker: — Minimum price.

Premier Douglas: — No, it simply stated "price"; it does not say the "minimum price"; it simply says \$1.25. But the "have-regard" clause comes into it, of course, and the fourth year it was to be not less than \$1.00 per bushel.

Some statements have been made about what Mr. Strachey said when this matter was being discussed in the Canadian House of Commons, and an attempt has been made to give the impression that Mr. Strachey, in a speech which he made in Winnipeg, held out hope that has not materialized. First of all, may I point out that Mr. Strachey's speech came as a result of a statement by Mr. Bracken, who was then leader of the Conservative Party in the House of Commons. Mr. Bracken said, in the House of Commons, on August 15,

March 21, 1951

1946, as recorded on page 4322 of Hansard:

“The agreement is the end of the Government’s policy of selling cheap wheat to the hungry nations of the world other than Britain, and it will be a handicap to us in trying to build up the market in all those other countries, which so interpret this agreement.

“I predict that, in two years’ time, or a little more, this agreement will blow up when the advantages to Britain are gone, and when her own people will be wanting to get food at the world price, as they have always wanted to, and when the world price will probably be lower than it is now.”

That was Mr. Bracken’s criticism — that the British would not be able to pay \$1.25 and \$1.00 a bushel, in the last two years; that the price might be down to 80 cents, and that the British would not be able to come through. As the result of that, Mr. Strachey made a statement, and I have a copy of his speech here, as recorded in the Winnipeg “Free Press.” Mr. Strachey said:

“It was an utterly unwarranted and monstrous suggestion that any British Government would refuse to pay the floor price under the Anglo-Canadian Wheat agreement should world prices fall heavily.”

That was the statement of the Rt. Hon. John Strachey — and here is a paragraph that I want to quote of Mr. Strachey’s speech, because it is the kernel of his speech, and it completely disproves many of the things that have been attributed to Mr. Strachey. He said:

“I repeat that the essence of the agreement . . .”

Notice those words, Mr. Speaker —

“. . . the essence of the agreement is that in return for selling us wheat at \$1.55 during the first two years, the Canadian farmers get the protection of minimum floor prices of \$1.25 and \$1.00 for their wheat, in the third and fourth years, respectively, and I reiterate that it has been an inescapable obligation of the British Government to pay at least those prices, however low the world price of wheat may go, so I trust we shall hear no more of the suggestion that, to put it plainly, calls in question the honour of the British Government.”

Mr. Strachey is saying here, and he goes on to point out that, in his opinion, what the Canadian farmer is doing is to purchase insurance by giving wheat in the first two years at \$1.55, in return for which he will get floor prices of \$1.25 and \$1.00 a bushel in the last two years, irrespective of what the world price might be.

Now, I do not agree entirely with Mr. Strachey's interpretation of the "have-regard-to" clause, as I shall show in a moment. I think it was more than insurance; but, Mr. Speaker, taking Mr. Strachey's words as they are, how can Liberal speakers, as they have attempted to do, all over this country, suggest that Mr. Strachey held out high hopes to the farmers that the British Government was going to make some payment other than the payment which they have made?

Now we come to the much discussed "have-regard-to" clause, and I will read that clause, Mr. Speaker, because it is important. It is recorded, as most members know, in Hansard, August 15, 1946, and clause (b) is the so-called "have-regard-to" clause. It says:

"The actual price to be paid for wheat to be bought and sold within the crop year 1948-49 shall be negotiated and settled . . ."

I draw attention to the word "settled" —

". . . between the United Kingdom Government and the Canadian Government not later than the 31st of December, 1947, and prices for wheat to be bought and sold within the crop year 1949-50 shall be negotiated and settled not later than the 31st of December, 1948. In determining the prices for these two crop years, 1948-49 and 1949-50, the United Kingdom Government will have regard to any difference between the prices paid under this agreement in the 1946-47 and 1947-48 crop years and the world prices for wheat in 1946-47 and 1947-48 crop years."

In other words, Mr. Speaker — and I do not need to interpret it myself — probably the best thing to do is to take Mr. Howe's interpretation. Mr. Howe, on June 5, 1950, read the section which I have just read, and said:

"That is the 'have-regard-to' clause in the agreement. I suggest that regard was paid in fixing these prices. The price for the first two years of the agreement was \$1.55. After negotiation the price for the third year was fixed at \$2.00, and after negotiation the price for the fourth year was fixed at \$2.00."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Have you got the page there?

March 21, 1951

Premier Douglas: — Yes, the page of Hansard is 3221.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the “have-regard-to” clause envisaged that the have-regard to phase would be concluded within the life of the agreement, and that in the December preceding the end of each crop year, the price would be fixed for the next crop year, and the price would be fixed at a figure that would compensate the farmers, if the price they had received in the first two years was very greatly below the world price.

I am loath to have to say, Mr. Speaker, but honesty compels one to do it, that, in the last few months, there has been a despicable attempt in this country to call in question the honour and the integrity of the British Government with regard to this agreement. We have heard such suggestions as “they have repudiated their obligations,” “have failed to live up to their obligations,” “welching on their obligations.” Now, I think it is only fair that we should look at the facts, because, as the reporter for the Sifton papers, reporting from Ottawa, pointed out, there seemed to be a very serious discrepancy between what the various Minister of the Crown thought with reference to this agreement. I am quoting now from the “Leader-Post” of March 16, 1951. This is their Ottawa correspondent. He finishes up his article with regard to wheat by saying:

“Trade Minister Howe and Agricultural Minister Gardiner have been as far apart as two minister of any government in explaining the same transaction. Mr. Gardiner has implied that the United Kingdom have not lived up the terms of the contract. Mr. Howe has said that the United Kingdom was not in default.”

Well, let us look at the record. The record shows, Mr. Speaker, first of all, that Mr. Howe spoke in the House of Commons on June 5 last, and this is what he said, and I am quoting from page 3221 of Hansard. He said:

“We went over the agreement while in London. We asked the United Kingdom Government what further settlement it is to make on account of the ‘have-regard-to’ clause. The United Kingdom Government took a very strong position that they had fulfilled all obligations under that clause, and so far as the United Kingdom Government was concerned. We agreed on behalf of Canada that considering all the circumstances that was the case.”

Now, I’ll repeat that.

“We agree, on behalf of Canada, that considering all the circumstances, that was the case.”

Now, for two weeks the Rt. Hon. James G. Gardner did everything he could to explain this away. He said there was a comma missing in the sentence, but he could not find where the comma should be. Then he accused Mr. Wright, the C.C.F. member for Melfort of misquoting Hansard and said that there was some discrepancy between revised Hansard and unrevised Hansard. Well, Mr.

Speaker, let it be said to the everlasting credit of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Howe — whether one may agree with his ideologies or not, he is a very blunt and honest person. He had enough of this shilly-shallying with the facts and he came out and repudiated any suggestion that any other interpretation could be placed upon his words than those which the words themselves stated. And when Mr. Quelch, the Social Credit member for Acadia, said, “Then your statement of June 5th still stands?” He said, “Of course it stands.” And it is reported very well. Instead of reading all the Hansard let me simply read the press report which condenses it very well. This is from the Regina “Leader-Post” of March 13th:

“Making a second and dramatic entry into the wheat debate in the Commons, Monday night, the Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, said that he deplored greatly the suggestion that the British Government had not played fair with the Canadian people in the settlement of the 4-year Canada-United Kingdom wheat agreement. Mr. Howe declared that the British Government had discharged its legal obligations under the agreement and is not in default. When he was in London last May he said that the British maintained that they had discharged their obligations under the agreement. They pointed out that there were risks on both sides in entering into an agreement for four years ahead covering such large quantities of wheat, ‘That was an understandable attitude’ . . . (this is Mr. Howe speaking) . . .” ‘and while I might have wished that the British Government could have seen the advantage of them making some further payments to Canadian wheat growers, I could not conscientiously say that they were in default under the agreement. I so reported to the Cabinet and to this House and to the Western wheat producers.’ . . . (That is the end of his quotation) . . .” As for his much quoted remarks in the House of June 5 last which Mr. Gardiner had been at great pains to show were not quite correctly reported in Hansard, the Trade Minister said that these words (and we quote here) ‘though uttered on the spur of the moment and in the heat of debate puts the position as I have stated it and I have no desire to alter them in any way’.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier has referred to the news report and I have Mr. Howe’s exact words here, just a couple of sentences, and I would like to read it so the Premier can comment on it. It is the Hansard of March 13th. Mr. Howe was speaking and he said this:

“The Minister of Trade and Commerce who has made the last formal statement on behalf of the Government, should be taken as interpreting the views of the Government at this stage in regard to the contract, then there is nothing owing under the contract.” (That is as Mr. Drew understood it).

March 21, 1951

Mr. Howe replied:

“Mr. Speaker, I stated definitely that the Government felt there was. I discussed the ‘have-regard-to’ clause. I said that the United Kingdom took the view that no more was owing; the Government did not share that view and they have said an amount that they thought appropriate.”

I think these news reporters the Premier has referred to must be incorrect.

Premier Douglas: — No, Mr. Speaker, the quotations are exactly the same in Hansard, if my hon. friend wants them as given in Hansard. Mr. Howe is not being misquoted. I don’t want my friend to pull a ‘Jimmie-Gardiner’ on me. There is no misquotation of Mr. Howe.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, here is his actual statement.

Premier Douglas: — Of course, and that is quite a correct statement; it fits in exactly with what it says here: that Mr. Howe said he wished that the British Government would have paid more, but on May 30th last the Canadian Government intimated to the British Government that they considered the matter settled in full. If the hon. member will just hold his horses a moment, I shall give him all the Hansard he wants. Now, let me quote then, not only Mr. Howe’s statement, but the statement of the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. St. Laurent, on March 12th of this year, when Mr. Coldwell was asking the Federal Government to table the documents that had been exchanged between the Canadian and the British Governments in order that this reflection on the good faith of the British Government might be either cleared up or definitely fixed. Mr. St. Laurent in discussing the motion for the production of papers said this:

“As a controversy has arisen in debate respecting the position taken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Howe, at London in May of 1950, and by the government since that time, I feel that the position should be made clear at once.”

I just want to give to my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition what the Prime Minister considers the position to be:

“The United Kingdom authorities took the position in May of 1950 . . . (the Prime Minister puts it in quotes) . . . ‘That all obligations under the have-regard-to clause might be considered to have been taken care of. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that this was a matter which could only be settled by the Canadian Cabinet on his return to Ottawa. After the discussion with his colleagues, the Minister of Trade and Commerce advised the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom that the Canadian Government was in accord with the conclusion in the agreed record of the meeting held with the United Kingdom authorities while he was in London.’”

That is one of the documents for which their consent to table has been requested. In other words, the Canadian Government accepted as the position of the United Kingdom that they had discharged their obligation under the agreement. Mr. Speaker, could anything be more crystal clear than that? We finally did get the documents tabled and they clear the whole matter up finally.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs quoted an article from the Toronto "Saturday Night", which is only a paragraph, and I'll read it. It says:

"The four-year wheat contract with the United Kingdom came to an end last July. Before that time C.D. Howe, the Minister responsible for wheat marketing, discussed its final settlement in London. The British are completely convinced that they have fulfilled their obligations. Howe agreed with them, as he told the House of Commons on June 5, and as the documents will prove if they are ever produced."

When the Minister of Municipal Affairs read that statement I understood the Leader of the Opposition to say "The documents will prove nothing of the sort." Well, Mr. Coldwell finally succeeded in getting these documents tabled and I must apologize for reading a lengthy document; but this document is the kernel of the whole matter and on this the whole case of Mr. Gardiner with reference to the statement that the British Government were in default, rises or falls: whether Mr. Gardiner was right, or whether Mr. Howe was right. This document is headed "The United Kingdom-Canadian Wheat Talks, May, 1950. Agreed record of a meeting in the Foreign Secretary's room in the House of Commons at 2.30 p.m. on Monday, 22nd of May, 1950." It tells who was present for the United Kingdom — the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations — I don't think I need to name those; and who was present for Canada — Mr. Howe, Mr. L.B. Pearson, Mr. Wilgress and so on. It tells who was the Secretary. It says:

"1. The meeting considered the following three questions in the light of discussion that has taken place since Friday, the 19th of May:

- (a) The quantity of wheat to be bought by the United Kingdom from Canada in the crop year 1950-1951.
- (b) The proportion of the quantity of (a) which the United Kingdom would take in the form of flour.
- (c) The final settlement of any question still outstanding under Clause 2B, the 'have-regard-to' clause of the United Kingdom-Canada contract of 1946.

"2. Conclusions reached on these subjects were as follows:

- (a) United Kingdom and Canadian Governments would both make agreed announcements on the result of the

March 21, 1951

conversation in the terms of the statement of Annex A. United Kingdom Government would have no objection to Mr. Howe stating publicly on his return to Canada, if he considered it desirable, that he thought it reasonable to assume that in 1950-51 Canada would be able to sell to the United Kingdom at competitive International Wheat Agreement prices somewhere between 100 and 120 million bushels of wheat. This quantity would include the carry-over of 12½ million bushels bought under the terms of the 4-year contract. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would also be prepared to make a public statement to the effect that the United Kingdom Government hoped that they would be able to meet their requirements for dollar wheat from their traditional market in Canada within International Wheat Agreement. That this would be possible provided that such wheat could be purchased on terms as to price, quality and position not less favourable than those obtained by any other buyer in the dollar market, whether in the United States of America or in Canada.

(b) As part of the purchase of Canadian wheat in the crop year 1950-51, the United Kingdom would agree to take 300,000 tons of flour provided it could be purchased on terms not less favourable as to price and quality than those obtained by any other buyer of flour on the dollar market, whether in the United States of America or in Canada. United Kingdom representatives made it clear that the purchase of 300,000 tons in 1950-51 would be without prejudice to a possible lower scale of purchase in 1951-52.”

I have read it all so that no one will say I am leaving anything out. These parts I have read so far have no relation to the subject in hand, but I want to read the whole document. (c) and this is the important clause; and remember, this is under (2) which says “The Conclusions reached on these three subjects were as follows” — the conclusions reached:

“(c) The United Kingdom was anxious not to be represented as having given assurances regarding wheat purchase in 1950-51 in return for the waiver of a claim by Canada under the ‘have-regard-to’ clause. The United Kingdom expected to make large purchases of wheat from Canada in any event, nevertheless, in the context of these discussions, the United Kingdom representatives felt that it would be reasonable that all obligations under the ‘have-regard-to’ clause might be considered to have been taken care of. Mr. Howe said that this was a matter which could only be settled by the Canadian Cabinet on his return.”

This is the end of the document. Now, Mr. Speaker, the next document is a document to the British Government dated Ottawa, May 30, 1950, sent to Sir Alexander Clutterbuck by the Secretary of the Privy Council.

It says:

“Dear Sir Alexander:

Regarding the recent talks in London I am sending you herewith a message for the Chancellor of the Exchequer from the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I would be grateful if this could be sent off to London at once.

Yours sincerely,

A.D.P. Heeney,
(Clerk of the Privy Council)”

This is the message:

“Sir Alexander Clutterbuck, High Commissioner for the United Kingdom, May 30th.

The following for the Chancellor of the Exchequer from the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have reported to my colleagues in the Cabinet on our recent wheat talks in London and wish to let you know that they are in accord with the conclusion recorded in paragraph two, (a), (b), and (c) of the agreed record of the meeting which was held in the Foreign Secretary’s room in the House of Commons on Monday, May 22nd.

In the circumstances I should very much like to make public the agreed statement today, May 30th, if possible, at 3 p.m. Ottawa time.”

Mr. Speaker, these documents show conclusively that Mr. Howe agreed on these three points, (a), (b) and (c), that he said of course he could not give final consent until he had met with his colleagues in the Cabinet, and that on May 30th a message was sent to the Chancellor of the Exchequer saying that the Canadian Government agreed, and agreed completely, with the three points under discussion. And Mr. Howe . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker,

Premier Douglas: — Will the Leader of the Opposition just keep still? I did not bother him yesterday when he was making his statement. Mr. Howe went even further. He then issued a statement. This statement appears, Mr. Speaker, in the “Canadian Weekly Bulletin, Information Division of the Department of External Affairs, Volume 4, No. 40”, and it is dated August 12th, 1949. It is headed “Wheat Agreement fulfilled”, and says:

“The terms of the Canada-United Kingdom Wheat Agreement for 1948-49 had been fully carried out, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Howe, stated on August 3rd. Final transactions to complete the third year of the agreement were concluded on July 27th between

March 21, 1951

the Canadian Wheat Board and the Imported Cereals Division of the United Kingdom Ministry of Food.”

Mr. Speaker, if ever a collection of documents and facts completely repudiated the distortions that have been carried on in the last few weeks with reference to this agreement, surely these documents prove it conclusively.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that men like Mr. Gardiner and any who have followed him, who have sought to cast a reflection on the good faith of the British Government by trying to tell the people of Canada that they did not on May 30th last agree that the obligations had been carried out in full, are doing a great disservice to this country. There has been, Mr. Speaker, a deliberate and wilful attempt to mislead the people of Canada on this important point. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what this is likely to do to our relations with our best customer for wheat. I wonder what this is likely to do for future long-term trading agreements and guaranteed prices. I wonder how any customer anxious to buy Canadian wheat will want to sit down with a government of which Mr. Gardiner is a member when they know perfectly well that at the first occasion he is likely to stick them in the back to save his political skin. This fiasco in the last few months has done more to ruin our market for wheat than anything that has happened in the last thirty years. And the Leader of the Opposition, of course, was not averse to playing ‘Little Sir Echo’ to this attempt of Mr. Gardiner’s as reported in the Regina “Leader-Post” of March 12th:

“Mr. Tucker emphasized that the quarrel was not with the British people but with the British Government.”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear!

Premier Douglas: — Notice this, Mr. Speaker;

“It was the Government and not the people who had repudiated the obligations.”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear!

Premier Douglas: — He said it was the British Government that had repudiated its obligations. His own Government on August 30th, 1950, by its own signed statement, signed by the Clerk of the Privy Council, signed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, told the Chancellor of the Exchequer that they considered the agreement to have been filled in every particular. And the Leader of the Opposition stands up and says it was the Government and not the people that had repudiated the obligation! And he goes on to say:

“If the British people knew the facts they would be just as angry with their government for breaking faith as are the farmers of Western Canada.”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, — “breaking faith”, when his own Government are on record. In spite of all Mr. Gardiner’s wriggling, Mr. Howe says they are on record, the Prime Minister says they are on record, now the documents that have been tabled prove they are on record, on the 30th of May — prove that they are on record as having accepted the agreement as being closed and all the obligations fulfilled. The Leader of the Opposition, to save his own political fortunes, is prepared to stand up in some public place or give a statement to the press saying that the British Government repudiated its obligations and that it broke faith under this agreement.

Mr. Kuziak: — Shame!

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that simply demonstrates the length to which a Liberal politician will go to dig himself out of a political hole into which he has fallen.

Mr. Tucker: — How far will you go to stir up trouble?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I listened to my hon. friend for an hour and a half yesterday and I did not say anything; but he probably has a guilty conscience, and I cannot blame him for not being able to restrain it. But, Mr. Speaker, he did not stop there. The Leader of the Opposition had to get another scapegoat. In the same article of March 12th, the “Leader-Post” reports Mr. Tucker as saying:

“Mr. Tucker charged that the stand taken by Municipal Affairs Minister Mr. McIntosh and Premier Douglas, that Britain had overpaid Western farmers under the wheat Agreement by over \$261 million could not have been other than harmful to the interest of producers when negotiations for further British payment were in a critical state. He said Mr. McIntosh had made the statement in the Legislature a few days before Agricultural Minister Gardiner and J.H. Wesson, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, had flown to London in a futile attempt to obtain an additional payment from Britain under the contract.”

I quote this, Mr. Speaker.

“Undoubtedly it influenced Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain in his oft-repeated statement to Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Wesson that the western wheat farmers are well off. Mr. Tucker declared that this of course, was typical of the Socialists. As long as the farmers have enough to eat, they shouldn’t be interested in profit.”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear! That is your attitude.

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, let us look at this statement. First of all, I made no statement on this matter. It says

March 21, 1951

Mr. McIntosh and the Premier. I made no statement. I wonder if my hon. friend is not addicted to being careless rather than meticulous of facts. The second thing is that the Minister of Municipal Affairs did not say that the farmers had been overpaid by \$261 million.

Mr. Tucker: — He certainly did.

Premier Douglas: — What the Minister of Municipal Affairs said, and the record proves it, was that the British Government had paid \$261 million more than the actual price called for in the agreement. In other words, he was showing clearly that, under the 'have-regard-to' clause, \$261 million had been paid over and above the actual prices which I have outlined.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, for anyone to suggest that Mr. McIntosh upset the settling of the Wheat Agreement — can you just imagine Mr. Atlee and the Chancellor of the Exchequer sitting down with Mr. Gardiner, and as they are discussing this matter, Mr. Atlee puffing on his pipe says, "Well, we were all prepared to give you another \$100 or \$200 million, but I see that 'Locky' McIntosh says that we have overpaid. Now, until 'Locky' McIntosh made that speech I did not know that we had overpaid you by \$261 million. I have never been very good at arithmetic, and therefore I did not know we had overpaid; and therefore we are not going to make any further payment".

Mr. Speaker, what a farce to make of public life, when a man stands up in his place and says that the Minister of Municipal Affairs prevented the farmers getting a settlement on something which had been settled 10 months before! The hon. member knew it had been settled 10 months before; it had been settled on May 30, last, and it had been announced publicly by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, through the "External Affairs Bulletin" on August 12.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the real fact is that the Liberal Party is now trying to get itself out of the fact that it has made some very serious blunders with reference to this whole question of the Wheat Agreement — and the Prime Minister admits that in his statement. I have here the speech made by the Prime Minister of Canada in the House of Commons on March 15, — last week; and he makes four points. He recognizes there have been these goings-on in the House between two of his Ministers, and he does his best to reconcile the difference. He makes four points, and I shall just quote them:

"He said the first point is that the United Kingdom had discharged all its legal obligations under the Wheat Agreement;

"The second point, in which there was agreement was, that, at the end of May 1950, the Canadian Government accepted the decision of the United Kingdom Government that they had discharged all their legal obligations under the contract;

"The third point was that the Canadian wheat growers . . ." (and this is significant) ". . . believed there was a continuing obligation under the 'have-regard-to' clause which had not been discharged in

full, and that, in the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the speech referred to by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew), the British Government itself was partly to blame for this expectation of the wheat producers because of a speech that had been made in Winnipeg by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Strachey.”

Well, I have already dealt with the speech by Mr. Strachey. Nobody by any stretch of imagination could interpret the speech which Mr. Strachey made, in 1946 — I may not agree with it; but nobody could possibly interpret that speech as meaning other than the fact that the payment in the last two years was an insurance by which the farmers would be guaranteed a price even if the world price went lower than \$1.25 and \$1.00 respectively. But this is the significant thing. He says:

“Now we all felt that the Canadian wheat growers had understandable grounds for this expectation — that there would be more done under the ‘have-regard-to’ clause than had been done; and our Government hoped — and I again use the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the speech referred to by the Leader of the Opposition — that the British Government would have seen the advantage to them of making some further payments.”

And further on, may I quote the Prime Minister as saying:

“The hon. member knows that what we were dealing with, when he spoke before the Canadian Clubs . . .”

He is speaking of Mr. Strachey.

“. . . I think the hon. members will agree with me that the wheat growers of the western provinces expected from that statement, and from similar statements made by our Minister of Agriculture and by our Minister of Trade and Commerce that there would be substantial consideration resulting from the obligation of the ‘have-regard-to’ clause.”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is admitting that the difficulty which the Liberal Government is in, is because their own Minister of Trade and Commerce and their own Minister of Agriculture had been going around giving the impression that there would be more coming, when he knew all the time that he and the Government of which he was a member had agreed that the deal was closed and finished.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the farmers entitled to, as a settlement?

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the hon. Premier suggested that I was careless with the truth in saying that

March 21, 1951

he had agreed with the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Now here is a report in the "Leader-Post" which was not contradicted by the Premier. He said this:

"Premier Douglas said that Britain had paid more in the last two years of the contract than was called for in the agreement."

Now that was a definite statement of the press, reporting a statement of Premier T.C. Douglas, in the "Leader-Post", February 26, 1951, that was never contradicted by the Premier.

Premier Douglas: — I thought my hon. friend was referring to the debate, and I took no part, as my hon. friend knows, in that particular debate with reference to that.

Mr. Tucker: — I was referring to a speech which you made.

Premier Douglas: — Now, what are the farmers entitled to under this Agreement? Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition said that, if the British Government does not owe the farmers anything under the 'have-regard-to' clause, what right have we to go to the Canadian Government to ask them for anything? Mr. Speaker, I want to point, first of all, two facts: one, that the Canadian Government acted as agents for the western wheat growers when they signed the Anglo-Canadian Agreement; they acted as agents for the western wheat growers, when, on May 30, last, they intimated to the British Government that they considered that the British Government had fulfilled all its obligations under the contract. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the British Government did not pay enough — the \$1.76 a bushel over the four-year period — then the Canadian Government has a responsibility, since they acted as agents, since they signed the agreement, and since they certified to the British Government that they considered that the British Government had fulfilled its obligations; they have a responsibility, as agents; but, Mr. Speaker, they have a far more significant obligation even than that, because when this Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement was before the House — as I said earlier, all the political parties voted for it — the Conservative Party, through its leader, Mr. Bracken, took the position that he doubted if the British could pay \$1.25 and \$1.00 a bushel in the last two years; he thought the thing would blow up. Mr. Coldwell took the opposite position. Mr. Coldwell took the position that, since the Government had already at that time begun to embark on a policy of removing price ceilings, there was a very strong possibility that the things the farmer had to buy would increase in price, whereas the price of the wheat which he had to sell would be fixed under this Agreement. Mr. Coldwell brought that to the attention of the House — I want to make a couple of just very short quotations. This is what he said, on August 15, 1946, and I have the Hansard here beside me. Mr. Coldwell said:

"I believe the Government would be well advised to consider this suggestion that, in the event of the costs of production rising for the next few years as they will do largely because of the Government's failure to maintain the price ceilings, any difference there may be between what the farmer receives for his wheat and the increased cost of production should be made up out of the consolidated revenue, finally."

And again, Mr. Coldwell, speaking on the same day, page 4825 of Hansard, said:

“The point I want to make quite clear is that, if the cost of production, the cost of living, continues to rise, a compensatory adjustment should be made out of the consolidated revenue. We cannot go back to Great Britain and say that they will have to pay more.”

Mr. Gardiner took part in that debate, and this is Mr. Gardiner’s statement of the same day, August 15, 1946, page 4826 of Hansard. Mr. Gardiner’s commitment here, to me is crystal clear. He said:

“What I want to point out is that under the floor price measure — that is not the proper name, but it will do — we stated to the House that \$200 million was being provided for the purpose of taking care of any adjustments in connection with what might be known as parity on other farm products. At the same time we stated to the House that similar arrangements would be made, if necessary, through the Wheat Board, in connection with grain.”

Mr. Speaker, there was, on August 15, 1946, when this Wheat Agreement with Great Britain was being discussed, a clear-cut commitment by the Rt. Hon. gentleman, the Minister of Agriculture for Canada, that since the Government was going to peg the price the farmer would receive for wheat, particularly in the first two years, should the cost of living and his cost of production continue to rise, there would be some compensatory adjustment made in a similar manner to that which was being provided under the Agricultural Prices Support Act, for which there is a fund of \$200 million available.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that obligation cannot be avoided, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why Mr. Gardiner has been trying to wiggle out of the obligation. That is why he has been going around and saying, “The British would put it out”, “somebody else would put it out”, when, as a matter of fact, he and his Government were committed to put it out if they allowed the cost of production to rise to a higher point than that which existed in 1946. The farmers have a claim. The hon. gentleman asked yesterday, “What right have we to go to the Canadian Government?” I say, Mr. Speaker, we have a right to go to the Canadian Government: one, because the Canadian Government fixed the price that the farmer would get for his wheat under that agreement in the first two years, and a floor price in the next two years; and secondly, at the same time when the farmers’ price was fixed, they took the price ceilings off and allowed the cost of everything the farmers had to buy soar sky high. Other people, when their costs went up could negotiate for higher wages or could raise the price of their goods that were sold across the counter, but the farmers’ price had been fixed by an international agreement to which the Canadian Government was a signatory. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Government, today, has the most solemn moral obligation that any government ever had, to keep faith with the farmers who, on the basis of that statement made by the Minister of Agriculture on August 15, 1946, took

March 21, 1951

him at his word and believed that if they accepted this Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement, if they agreed to sell their wheat at stated prices over a period of years, the Federal Government would either keep the costs of production down to where they were in 1946, or, failing to do that, would make some compensatory adjustment to the farmer whose cost of production had gone up while his price remained at the same level.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what claim has the farmer? Well, I am not going to try to make any extravagant claim for the farmers. A great many figures have been bandied about, but, as I pointed out earlier, during the four years of the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement — during the first two years of the Wheat Agreement we sold, at \$1.55 a bushel, 339½ million bushels of wheat. The average price for Class 2 wheat at that time was \$2.65 a bushel — or \$1.10 a bushel more. Now I agree with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) on this point, when he argues that if this 339½ million bushels had been thrown on the open market in the first two years of the Wheat Agreement, the Class 2 wheat would certainly not have been as high as it was, and we probably would not have got \$2.65 a bushel for it. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that even if it had fallen off one-third — and that is a very large assumption, that is stretching it to the very limit; even if it had fallen off one-third, there is still a figure of about \$269 million on which the farmer has a legitimate claim with regard to the first two years of that agreement.

Mr. Tucker: — How much did the Premier say?

Premier Douglas: — I said \$269 million.

Mr. Tucker: — And yet you say the British Government owes nothing.

Premier Douglas: — I did not say the British Government owes nothing. I said the Canadian Government said, on May 30, that the British Government owed nothing; that is who said it.

Mr. Tucker: — They did not say anything of the sort.

Premier Douglas: — My friend says they didn't say anything of the sort. The document was read to him. The Minister of Trade and Commerce announces it through the official publication of the Department of External Affairs — and he says they did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. Tucker: — The official statement did not say it though.

Premier Douglas: — I don't know how you would penetrate some people's mind — except with a brace and bit. After they have the documents in front of them, they say they did not say anything of the sort.

Well, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of making up to the farmers for the fact that prices were allowed to rise while their price was held, in those first two years, at \$1.55 — \$269 million would make it 19.1 cents per bushel. Then there is the 3.8 cents which is already in the pool, which is going to be paid out. Then there is the \$48 million, about which I think no one will quarrel, that we feel is coming to the farmers by virtue of the fact that 160 million bushels of wheat was sold to the millers,

for domestic consumption, at a figure of \$1.25 a bushel, when the price under the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement was \$1.55. If that 30 cents a bushel was repaid to the farmers — and there is no reason why the farmers should subsidize cheap bread; the Canadian people, as a whole, should subsidize it if we are going to have cheap bread — that 30 cents a bushel would work out at 3.4 cents a bushel on the five-year pool. So, with the 3.8 cents which is in the pool, and the \$48 million which makes 3.4 cents, and the \$269 million to make up for the fact that we sold for considerably below the Class 2 wheat for the first two years of the agreement, which works out to 19.1 cents. That makes 26.3 cents a bushel.

Now, I am not going to argue one way or the other about a million this way or a million that way. A very good case could be made for that figure. Indeed, some people have made cases for a much higher figure. But, Mr. Speaker, I say this: I have not heard anybody on that side of the House or anywhere else, try to make a case for 8.3 cents a bushel. Nobody can make a case for that, because it is fantastic, absolutely fantastic. As a matter of fact if one takes the trouble to check what the prices were that were paid for Class 2 wheat during the four years of the agreement — \$2.43 the first year, \$2.88 the second year, \$2.23 the third year, \$2.19 the fourth year; if you look at the price that was paid, in United States — and remember, this is on average wheat; you can't compare that with No. 1 Northern; but the average price — you find that No. 1 Hard Red Winter wheat at Galveston, Texas, sold at \$2.36 per bushel, or at an average worked out at about \$2.35 during the life of that agreement.

Mr. Tucker: — And yet you say the British owe nothing.

Premier Douglas: — I did not say the British owe nothing.

Hon. Members: — You sure did.

Premier Douglas: — The hon. gentleman across the way says I said the British owe nothing. I say the Canadian Government, who acted as agents for the wheat farmers, told the British they owed nothing, and they sent them a solemn declaration, on May 30, saying “You don't owe anything under the agreement” and the hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to wiggle out and they cannot do it.

Mr. Tucker: — You are putting the wrong . . .

Premier Douglas: — Either Mr. Howe and the Prime Minister are lying, or the gentlemen opposite are trying to mislead this House . . .

Mr. Tucker: — You are trying to mislead the House.

Premier Douglas: — . . . when they say that the Canadian Government did not agree that the British had fulfilled their obligations in every particular.

Mr. Tucker: — You said the British Government overpaid.

Premier Douglas: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I note I have said they overpaid . . .

Mr. Tucker: — That was your statement in the “Leader-Post”.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

March 21, 1951

Premier Douglas: — I am afraid the hon. gentleman opposite must have a very guilty conscience . . .

Mr. Tucker: — You are the one.

Premier Douglas: — . . . to do so much yelling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to sum up the points I have tried to make, I am going to enumerate them so that there will be no misunderstanding about them:

1. That, in 1946, all political parties in Canada agreed to the terms of the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement;
2. That the C.C.F. believes that bulk trading and long-term contracts for the sale of farm commodities is still a sound basis for marketing;
3. That the British Government paid \$2.06 a bushel in the last two years of the Agreement in recognition of the 'have-regard-to' clause;

Mr. Tucker: — Just one year of the Agreement.

Premier Douglas: —

4. On May 30, 1950, the Canadian Government signified that it was in complete agreement with the United Kingdom Government, that the latter had fully discharged its obligations under the Wheat Agreement;
5. That the main reason for the farmers discontent is that removal of price ceilings by the Federal Government allowed the cost of production to rise, and made prices which were acceptable, in 1946, completely inadequate in 1948 and 1949;
6. That, in 1946, the Federal Government had agreed that if the cost of production rose to a point where the prices established under the Wheat Agreement were inadequate, then some compensatory adjustment would be made through the Wheat Board in a manner similar to that which was provided under the agricultural Prices Support Act;
7. It is our contention that the Federal Government owes the farmers \$48 million for wheat used for domestic consumption at a price considerably less than was paid by Great Britain under the Wheat Agreement;
8. It is also our contention that the Federal Government, in addition, should make a substantial payment to the five-year pool to compensate the farmers for the fact that they allowed the farmers' cost of production to rise at the same time that the price for their commodity was fixed by a set agreement entered into by the Canadian Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on just one other thing. The Leader of the Opposition, yesterday, told the House that his party, the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, is going to support this resolution which we are now debating. Well, I am sure that we will all be pleased to hear that he is going to support a resolution which, I want to remind the House, Mr. Speaker, calls upon the Government of Canada to pay \$48 million as a return of the subsidy paid by the producers on domestic wheat, plus a further substantial payment in addition to the \$65 million token payment already announced.

Mr. Tucker: — Read the rest of it. That is important. You left it out before.

Premier Douglas: — I did not leave it out before. I will be very glad to read it:

“In addition to the \$65 million token payment already announced in consideration of the ‘have-regard-to’ clause of the Canada-U.K. Agreement.”

The Leader of the Opposition and his party are now going to support this resolution.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — They are now going to vote a vote of censure on the Federal Government which is only announcing a payment of 8.3 cents . . .

Mr. Tucker: — They may pay the rest . . .

Premier Douglas: — They are now going to stand up and vote to censure Mr. Gardiner and the Liberal Cabinet because they have not done their duty by the western farmers. They are now going to stand up and vote and say, by the casting of their ballot, that the Liberal Government at Ottawa has broken faith with the wheat producers and has not paid the wheat producers the amount of money to which they are entitled.

Mr. Tucker: — You are getting funnier all the time!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Korchinski: — That is going too far!

Premier Douglas: — Oh, the member for Redberry did not make a lot of noise — he could make much more by banging his head on his desk. It would be much more effective.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is rather significant that, while the Liberal members in this House say they are going to support this resolution — and I don’t suppose they dare do anything else — the Liberal members at Ottawa, last week, on March 15, voted down a resolution to pay the wheat producers of Western Canada 25 cents a bushel final payment on the five-year pool.

March 21, 1951

Mr. Tucker: — It would not have paid them a cent. That is another misrepresentation.

Premier Douglas: — Here is the resolution, moved by Mr. Wright, C.C.F. member for Melfort, calling for the payment of 25 cents a bushel on every bushel of wheat delivered to the five-year pool . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — Wright was wrong.

Premier Douglas: — . . . and in those voting ‘yes’, I do not see a single Liberal member. The only members who got up and voted for that were the Social Credit members and the C.C.F. members; but, Mr. Speaker, when we come to the ‘no’s’, I notice all the Conservative members and all the Liberal members — at least those that were voting. I notice, for instance, that Mr. Bater from The Battlefords, Mr. Boucher from Rosthern, Mr. Harrison from Meadow Lake, Mr. Hetland from Humboldt, Mr. Larson from Kindersley . . .

Hon. Member: — What about Mr. Ferris?

Premier Douglas: — Yes, we will see if we can find Mr. Ferris . . .

Hon. Member: — Like the Atlantic pact.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — No, I don’t see Mr. Ferris. I notice Mr. Larson of Kindersley was voting against it, Mr. Smith of Moose Mountain, Mr. Stewart of Yorkton; I notice Mr. Studer, I notice Mr. Whiteside of Swift Current; and I noticed that all the Liberals who voted, voted against paying the farmers 25 cents a bushel. Mr. Speaker, when I read that I was somewhat amazed, because it took my mind back to the time when the Leader of the Opposition was in the Federal House . . .

Mr. Tucker: — How long does it take for the resolution?

Premier Douglas: — . . . and when he stood up and said, “I don’t know what I should do” — he was talking about taxing the co-ops and he said, “I don’t know what I should do”. He said, “If I had a dozen Liberals from Saskatchewan here, things would be different”. Ah, Mr. Speaker, there was Horatio holding the bridge! And Horatio sent back for reinforcements and the people of Saskatchewan sent him reinforcements — and what happened? Horatio isn’t there any more, and all the reinforcements are under the bridge! Not one of them, not one of the entire fourteen Liberal members from Saskatchewan, stood up and voted to pay 25 cents a bushel to the farmers of Western Canada on the wheat which they delivered under the five-year Agreement.

Mr. Tucker: — Read the actual motion and the amendment.

Premier Douglas: — I would be very glad to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Tucker: — If it had carried, it would not have paid them a cent.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — I have got so used to the Leader of the Opposition that when you prove something is black, he keeps on saying it is white. He has been wriggling out of political mudholes for so long that he has become an expert; but I am telling him, Mr. Speaker, he is not going to be able to wriggle out of this one — not at all. The fact is that the Leader of the Opposition, yesterday, said to this House, “We must not allow this issue to become a political football.” They have made nothing but a political football for months. Mr. Gardiner made it a political football, an international political football, by trying to throw the blame on a government that could not answer back, if it was going to continue good relations within the Commonwealth, and it was left to one of his fellow colleagues to put him in his place by repudiating the statement which he made. The hon. gentlemen opposite have put it into the whole realm of politics by attempting to get out of the situation by trying to blame the Minister of Municipal Affairs because of a statement which he had made which was in complete accord with the facts.

And this last pathetic attempt — to suggest that, after all, there are only a few western members down there — look at all the other members there are in the House of Commons! Well, Mr. Speaker, the majority of those members in the House of Commons belong to the Liberal Party, and if the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan is in favour of paying the farmers another \$48 million plus a substantial payment, then why is not the Liberal party at Ottawa prepared to do it? Or are we to believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is simply a political trick by which those who are here, and have no responsibility, will say “yes”, but those who hold the purse-strings will say “no”. To try to intimate that if the farmers make too many demands for a fair deal, if the farmers go too far in demanding that Mr. Gardiner should keep the commitment which he made on August 15, 1946, that the farmers would get some compensatory adjustment; to suggest that if we do that we will interfere with orderly marketing, I say the very opposite is the case. I say that unless the farmers get a fair deal, and unless these uncalled for attacks upon the good faith of the United Kingdom Government are discontinued, these gentlemen opposite and the party to which they belong will destroy the whole principle of orderly marketing and bulk trading and long-term agreements. There isn't any doubt about that.

So I say to the gentlemen opposite: I am very glad to know they are going to vote for this motion. I want to tell them, however, that, as far as the people of this province are concerned, they will want them to do more than vote for it; they will want them to do something about it. They are very close to the people who can do something about it. The words of Emerson are very true, with regard to the gentlemen opposite:

“What you are and what you do, speaks so loudly I can't hear what you say”.

I shall support the motion.

The question being put on the motion, it was agreed to unanimously.

The Assembly adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.