

the Senate adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 5, at 8 p.m. It is of course understood that should an emergency arise in the meantime His Honour the Speaker will exercise his authority to recall us.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD BILL

FIRST READING

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill 13, an Act to amend The Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1935.

The Bill was read the first time.

SECOND READING

Hon. J. H. KING moved the second reading of the Bill.

He said: Honourable senators, this is the last of the three interrelated measures that deal largely with Prairie conditions. The other two, which have been passed, are the Wheat Acreage Reduction Bill and the Prairie Farm Assistance Bill.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend The Canadian Wheat Board Act of 1935. The amendments are very brief. Under the Act of 1935 the price of wheat was fixed at 70 cents a bushel. It is now proposed to increase that price to 90 cents a bushel. The aim of the other amendment in this measure is to clarify the regulations controlling deliveries of all kinds of grain by producers to country elevators, loading platforms, mills, mill elevators and terminal elevators. The word "mills" is new. It was thought well to insert it.

Any discussion there may be will, I think, centre around the increase in price from 70 cents to 90 cents. As was stated in our committee when the other Bills were under consideration, it is deemed desirable that the acreage of wheat should be controlled and the production of the coarser grains should be stimulated with a view to increasing the production of animal fats. It has also been thought desirable to increase the growing of flax for the production of oil. Although this Bill was not officially before our committee when it met, I think it was thoroughly discussed and inquired into at that time. Mr. Gardiner, the Minister of Agriculture, appeared before the committee and gave us some very useful information. Therefore it seems unnecessary for me to dilate upon the matter.

Hon. Mr. KING.

Hon. J. J. DONNELLY: Honourable senators, yesterday we had before us in the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce the acreage bonus Bill, and we were told by the Minister of Agriculture that one of its main purposes was to prevent a great increase in our wheat surplus. We heard some strong arguments advanced along that line, and a very convincing argument was presented to this House by the honourable senator from Lethbridge (Hon. Mr. Buchanan). But to-day we have a Bill which raises the price of wheat from 70 cents to 90 cents. If it had been the desire of the Government to increase the wheat acreage and bring about a greater production, nothing I can think of would have been more helpful for that purpose than the raising of the price by almost 25 per cent.

I am not one of those who think we should worry about a wheat surplus. We have, I understand, a surplus of 400,000,000 bushels. The surplus in the four principal wheat-producing countries—the United States, Canada, Australia and the Argentine—is estimated at, I think, 1,300,000,000 bushels. This looks like a very large quantity; but this war is not going to last for ever, and when peace comes there is going to be, I think, a scarcity of wheat. The scorched-earth policy which has been followed in Europe will prevent the growing of wheat there for some time to come, particularly in the Ukraine, and I think we might very well go on accumulating a surplus. All of it will be needed, for when peace comes there will be a state of semi-starvation in Europe. It may be said that the countries of Europe will not be able to buy our wheat. Even if they are not, it would be an act of Christian charity to give it to them, and I think it would be proper to do so. This world will never come back to normal conditions until the countries that have been overrun have had an opportunity to recover, and we might help them in that way.

The Bill before us, it seems to me, is a type of class legislation. I understand that it applies only to Western Canada, and, even there, only to the producer of grain. We in Ontario have crop failures, but when we do we have to put up with the loss. I am not exactly a pioneer, but in the part of Bruce from which I come half the country was under standing timber when I was a boy, and we could not get a ten-acre field that was free of stumps. In those days the settlers had to make good or go under. They went into the country with the intention of making good, and they succeeded. I am not entirely