

I think any sane, sound business man must take cognizance of facts such as these, and act accordingly.

The government, I believe, should continue to pay storage on the balance of the quota of wheat on the farm, as is being done at the present time. I also believe that the government should pay an advance on that part of the quota which the farmer holds on his farm because he cannot deliver it. The farmer must get a living anyway, and if the wheat is there to be delivered, the government would not be taking any great chances in making an advance.

The question of storage was brought up by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie. If we allow something like ten per cent for working space, the elevators have a storage capacity of 582 million bushels, and paying eight cents a bushel on their full capacity means that somebody will have to pay \$46,560,000 a year for storage. As we are now in a war period, I think the people of Canada should pay this charge rather than that the farmers themselves should be made to stand this expense.

Agriculture is pretty well wrecked now. If this is allowed to go on, complete wrecking of the industry will be the result. I do not think Canada can afford to have agriculture in any worse plight than it is at the present time. Do not forget that there are war debts to pay, and that all taxes are paid either directly or indirectly by the agricultural industry.

In addition, I believe the government should continue where it left off, with international cooperation with the wheat producing countries. This has been advocated for the past three or four years by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch), myself and others.

I should also like to see the grain exchange closed. We have been told that it is being kept open at the request of the cereals board in England. That argument does not appear to me to have any force, because seemingly the British government has closed the exchanges over there since the war started, and if that course is good for England, why is it not good for Canada? Perhaps we are yet capable of being skinned a little more. That skinning should cease, and cease right away.

In conclusion, may I allude to that old theme, Canadian unity. We have heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), several of the cabinet ministers and private members plead for national unity. We have been told by others that unity is impossible while one part is slave and the other part free. I suggest that it is about time to free a very large percentage of our people who have been and

are slaves, and I make this plea to the government now, that they take into consideration this group's recommendations which I have just placed on record.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Like the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader), I am probably not so much concerned personally about the wheat problem because, as in his case, cattle has solved my problem. As a Canadian citizen, however, I am vitally concerned about this very important matter of wheat.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), speaking on the floor of this chamber on Wednesday, March 26, in reply to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn), attempted to place the blame on the opposition in this house for the fact that we have not had an opportunity to discuss agriculture, and all its difficulties, at a much earlier date. He stated that when he first attempted to bring in his estimates, on February 27, I asked him to make a statement. I did ask him at half-past ten on that evening, as he stated, if he would make a statement in order to give some lead to the agricultural producers of the country as to what might be expected of them, in the matter of agricultural production, to assist in the war effort during this coming year; and I suggest that that request was very much in order. Then, on March 5, the hon. member for Haldimand rose to introduce an amendment to the motion to go into supply. He was not allowed to complete his speech until March 26. During the interval, on March 12, the Minister of Agriculture announced this acreage bonus scheme which we are now discussing.

May I say that, as a result of my experience as a member for three or four years of the advisory committee under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, I, speaking on November 14 last in this chamber, advocated a scheme somewhat similar in principle to this one, but on a much broader basis. I am convinced that something must be done to reduce the wheat acreage of this country, but, like other speakers, I also am convinced that the producers, on the quota which they are allowed to deliver, must receive somewhere near a parity price for what they are allowed to deliver. I spoke several times last year and, I think, proved conclusively that the parity price at that time was approximately \$1.25 a bushel, Fort William—certainly a great contrast to this allowance of 70 cents.

I am opposed to handling this matter in the manner proposed by the government. I was disappointed that the minister did not introduce a bill covering these regulations or the operation of this scheme. Such dictatorial