

board; that is, the wheat board would not receive any grain from the western farmer until the price dropped to 90 cents. The result was that the farmers of western Canada lost millions of dollars to the grain trade. I contended at that time that this action was beyond the powers of the government.

Mr. QUELCH: It was, not disallowed, either.

Mr. HANSELL: A year later the Liberal government set the pegged price of grain at 80 cents. This year the price is to be 70 cents. I know that some Liberal speakers have played up the term "initial" price, but we have not heard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) or any other speaker on the government side intimate for a moment that the price is likely to be fixed eventually at higher than 70 cents. It is a foregone conclusion in the minds of agriculturists that the price of grain this year will be tantamount to a fixed price of 70 cents.

May I ask why there has been a fluctuation of pegged prices? At one time it was 87½ cents, at another 80 cents, and this year it is 70 cents. If once upon a time it was 87½ cents, and that was a reasonable figure at which to set the price, it must be right this year to set the same price. The cost of production has not gone down. I cannot give the Conservative government a great deal of credit for setting a price of 87½ cents, for I think it reasonable to conclude that the policy of government seems to be to look over the world situation, to consider the surpluses and the grain situation generally and as it may appear to be in the coming months, and then to try to guess a figure to which the world price will not fall.

It is true that for the last crop year the government will have to bonus the wheat farmer perhaps thirty or forty million dollars. I am wondering whether, if the government had known last year that the price would drop, involving such a bonus, they would have set the price at 80 cents. I affirm again that if the set price of 87½ cents was reasonable one year then it is reasonable this year. I believe that the reason why the price has not been set at 80 cents or 87½ cents is that the government recognize that it is a money problem. They recognize that this year it may cost them something if they set the price any higher than 70 cents. The money problem seems to be worrying the government in this connection. But I do not see why they have any need to be worried. I recall those great and flashing speeches and promises preceding the last general election when they said that they would do battle with the money powers and issue currency and

[Mr. Hansell.]

credit in terms of public need. They said they would issue currency and credit in terms of industrial need—in terms of domestic need. Surely the great wheat-growing industry of this country is in need. Yet now they seem frightened lest they should have to pay a little bit in order to keep that wheat-growing industry on its feet. I see the hon. member for Rosthern is not in his seat, perhaps he is getting his breath behind the screen; oh, he appears again. I cannot follow his logic when he says that to vote against this bill will destroy the program, or to vote against this government will destroy the program. Surely he must recognize that there are people in Canada who are just as capable of bringing down legislation as is the Liberal government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. HOWARD: That is beyond question.

Mr. HANSELL: I say that when once there is a progressive government sitting on the treasury benches, progressive along the lines of monetary reform, as the hon. member for Rosthern preaches, they will be able to bring down legislation that will give the farmers of western Canada the cost of production of their crop, plus a profit that they can live on.

Mr. TUCKER: If they have to wait that long, it will be too bad for the farmers of western Canada.

Mr. HANSELL: I suppose the hon. member for Rosthern can make a guess which may be as true as mine. But an election will tell the tale.

I said that the money problem seems to be worrying the present government. When the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston) brought in his resolution a few weeks ago asking for a minimum price of 95 cents, the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) spoke to that resolution. He had not got very far in his speech when one of the ministers "twigged" that he was attempting to show the government how they could get the money to pay 95 cents a bushel; and what happened? Of course that minister raised a point of order, and the hon. member for Lethbridge was ruled out of order. I say that with no reflection whatsoever on the chair, but simply to bring out the picture of that day's debate. I read it in *Hansard* the other day, and if anyone will turn over just two pages he will find that the Minister of Agriculture spoke on the resolution and bemoaned the fact that it was impossible to pay such a bonus because they did not have the money. Well, we have been trying for a long time to tell them where they can get the money.