

that only actual farmers who know they cannot get repairs, cannot buy twine, cannot go to the bank and get a dollar, are to stand." Do you know, there was not a man there but rose? One happened to be a brother-in-law of mine, and I thought I knew his financial standing; so when the meeting was over I went to him and asked him: "Why did you stand up, a man with the holdings you have? What do you mean by it?" He said: "You don't know the story at all; I went to the bank the other day and could not borrow \$40." Now let me tell you the standing of that man. He has ten quarter sections of land clear that I know of, thirty as fine Belgian horses as you ever looked at, a threshing machine, five good binders, a barn that cost over \$5,000, 120 feet long, and buildings in accordance; and he is not one of these men who is just growing grain, he had a good herd of cattle as well. He said: "What would be the use of my going back when I could not get \$40?" I said, "Charlie, do you owe the bank anything?" "Oh, yes," he said, "about \$2,200." The barn alone had over \$5,000 invested in it, to say nothing of the land; there was a crop of wheat ready for the binders, and yet the bank was afraid to let him have any money. The manager said: "I will have to write to the head office." These managers of branch banks are scared stiff; they would not lend the best man in the country any money to-day. Now I say it is time there was an investigation made.

Another resolution, moved by A. Currie, seconded by A. Kirch, is as follows:

That the Canadian currency be inflated to a parity with the British pound or less.

That was the feeling of our meeting, comprising over 200 farmers. They said: We cannot go on in this way; we cannot sell wheat at this price and live; you will have to do something. So if we do not get results from the world economic conference I am prepared to say: Let us inflate our money. In connection with Australia, do not forget that our wheat is superior to Australian wheat, but even at that Australia is getting more for her wheat—that is in her own money—although ours is away above it in quality and would naturally have the preference in the market.

Here is another resolution, moved by Dennis Pattison, seconded by A. Kirch:

That the banks be nationalized and that we have a managed currency.

Well, I do not think there is anything very serious about that. I have another that will probably shock some hon. members. Moved by A. Currie, seconded by J. Durham:

That the producers of wheat receive a price of \$1.35 a bushel for wheat milled for consumption in Canada.

I do not think there is anything very shocking about that either. We could well afford to pay the farmers of western Canada \$1.35 a bushel for the wheat that is consumed at home. I do not think it would hurt the bread eater a bit; in fact I do not think it would make a bit of difference in the price of bread. Someone who lives in Montreal told me he had never paid less than ten cents a loaf for bread there. If that is the case, do you think it would make any difference at all if we paid \$1.35 for the wheat? This would help to the extent of forty or fifty million bushels. I do not think Canada would suffer or that the consumer of bread would suffer. That audience was not radical at all. I submitted this resolution to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) when it first came down—

Mr. HOWARD: What did he say?

Mr. LOUCKS: He could not endorse the resolution as submitted.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Did he come across?

Mr. LOUCKS: He is a farmer in western Canada and he knows our need. We know the criticisms that formerly came from the other side of the house, but we are not hearing them so much now. The manufacturers want to be subsidized, but the conviction is now becoming general that neither the manufacturer nor the professional man can get anywhere until the farmer does. I have spoken with lawyers and doctors and they all realize that they will never prosper until the farmer has some money. My hon. friend the other day said that Saskatchewan alone had produced \$6,000,000,000. You had no depression down here when we were shipping millions and millions of bushels of wheat and sending the money here—not only millions but the Prime Minister said billions at one time. The manufacturer was getting along nicely then. I know we were accused of being extravagant, but after all I have not much use for the hoarder; it is the man who puts his money in circulation who keeps the wheels turning, not the one who wants to live in a shack. When I think of what I went through in that western country when I lived in a shack, I cannot imagine that anyone would find fault because I put up a good house when I was able to do so. Why shouldn't I? Is there any condemnation of me because I bought an automobile, and put a radio in the house to keep the boys there? I think it is the best place for them. We talk about the