

delegation represent? They represented the United Farmers of Alberta; the United Farmers of Manitoba; the United Farmers of Canada (Saskatchewan section); the boards of trades of Regina, Saskatoon, Edmonton and Calgary; the Alberta wheat pool; the Manitoba pool elevators; the Saskatchewan wheat pool; the North West Grain Dealers' Association; the United Grain Growers; the Alberta municipal association and the Manitoba government. Surely such a delegation was truly representative of our people.

I have received, as have all hon. members, a great many resolutions passed by different associations in western Canada. I have a file two inches thick full of them, but I do not intend to read them all to the house. I received one from the Winnipeg and district trades and labour congress asking for an 80-cent initial price. I received another one from an association of Ukrainian farmers, a fine type of farmer in my district, asking for the continuation of the 80-cent bonus. I received one from the city council of Portage la Prairie asking for the continuation of this bonus. I received one from the United Farmers of Manitoba, (Portage district). I received one from the Warren agricultural society, from the Fortier cooperative elevator association, from the Portage board of trade, from the rural municipality, from the Manitoba Pool Elevators Limited, from the Oakville cooperative elevators association and from the Edwin cooperative elevators association. Have I not the right to stand up in this house and give whole-hearted support to this request?

Mr. HAYHURST: Does the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) mean the continuation of the fixed price?

Mr. LEADER: Yes, the 80 cent price.

Mr. GARDINER: Most of them asked for the other as well?

Mr. LEADER: For the bonus? No. I may say I have not received one resolution or letter asking for the acreage bonus.

Mr. GARDINER: The Bracken resolution asked for a plan of insurance on an acreage or some other basis.

Mr. LEADER: That is different from this acreage bonus. They asked for an insurance plan, which they have been considering in Manitoba for several years. I do not think, however, they object to an acreage bonus plan. I do not either, but what I do object to is paying a tax when you do not receive any benefits. That is really what caused what is known as the Boston tea party.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): But they might need help from the fund in another year.

Mr. LEADER: That is quite possible, but I would suggest that at least for this year, until this project gets under way, this levy should not be made. There is a limitation of 5,000 bushels provided for, which I support whole-heartedly. I have always taken that view. If the big farmer wants to grow more wheat than that, that is his privilege, but government support should be limited to the 5,000 bushels. I think that is a wise provision, and it should decrease materially the amount that will have to be paid out.

Mr. HAYHURST: Does the hon. member not think that 5,000 bushels is too much?

Mr. LEADER: That is a matter for adjustment. I do not want to suggest that the government accepted my suggestion, but that was the figure I mentioned when talking to members of the government. I think it is a wise provision.

I shall not delay the house further than to say that the meeting in Portage la Prairie was called expressly to discuss the initial payment of 80 cents. It was a large and representative meeting, and it passed the following resolution:

Resolved that this meeting of farmers of Portage la Prairie district, assembled this eighth day of April, do hereby protest the action of the dominion government in reducing the board price of wheat from eighty cents to sixty cents, and strongly urge that the eighty-cent price be maintained.

The resolution had my support; therefore I shall vote against the bill, which provides for an initial payment of only 70 cents.

Mr. BRUCE McNEVIN (Victoria, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part briefly in this debate on what I might term the wheat bonus policy, I want to make perfectly clear that I do not subscribe to the principle that there exists a conflict or cleavage between the interests of the eastern Canada farmer and those of the western Canada farmer, or indeed as between eastern Canada, central Canada and western Canada. We all have very many things in common, and it is largely a question of getting down to a point where we can arrive at a policy which is in the best interests of the country as a whole.

Last night the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) in introducing this bill made it perfectly clear that in his opinion any benefits derived from the tariff protection policy in Canada as they reacted on the agricultural industry must be to the advantage of the western Canada farmer as well as the eastern Canada farmer, and in that contention I fully concur.