

Mr. MANION: The minister corrected me and said that he was trying to keep the people from using the word "price." He said he was referring to it as an advance, but I am pointing out that in the explanatory notes of Bill No. 63 the phrase "such fixed price per bushel" is used. The government itself uses that wording, so we cannot be expected to invent some other expression in order to save the government from a mistake it has made.

I was going to refer to another matter. The minister discussed the cost of production. I am not going to discuss this matter at any length because I have not the power or the right to do so. This matter has been dealt with throughout the country at great length, and I have heard it discussed in this house during all the years I have been here. The minister quoted a professor who gave an average cost of production of between 30 and 40 cents for a two-section farm producing 20 bushels to the acre. I submit that there is a danger of causing misunderstanding between the east and the west when such figures are given out. When the eastern business man reads that wheat can be produced for between 30 and 40 cents, he feels the westerner is getting very generous treatment when he receives an advance payment of 70 cents.

Mr. GARDINER: I think we should clear up this point. The phrase quoted by my hon. friend from the explanatory notes is a quotation from the old bill. In this bill it is initial payment.

Mr. MANION: It does not matter very much, but I am reading from the bill which was reprinted with corrections by order of the house passed May 2, 1939. The words in the explanatory notes of this Bill No. 63 are:

(e) to pay to producers delivering wheat at the time of delivery or at any time thereafter as may be agreed upon. . . .

Mr. EULER: Is my hon. friend reading from the explanatory notes?

Mr. MANION: Yes.

Mr. EULER: He will notice that the underlined words are repealed.

Mr. MANION: That is correct. I am glad to be corrected because I have no desire to misinform the house. I was reading it rather hurriedly. In the original bill the words were "initial price," is that not correct?

Mr. EULER: I think the same words as before.

Mr. MANION: It does not really change the argument I was making. I was arguing that to set a figure of 60 cents, or 70 cents

as it is now, is to state to the outside world a price which the outside world will be inclined to accept as the valuation we put upon our wheat. That was my whole argument.

Mr. GARDINER: That is exactly why we changed the term from "fixed price" to "initial payment."

Mr. MANION: It does not change the fact that you have set the price at 70 cents.

Mr. EULER: How could it be avoided?

Mr. MANION: I want to finish by eleven o'clock because we are closing at that hour. I had a good deal more to say, but I do not intend to say it to-night. I want to suggest that in dealing with different sections of this country we should be tolerant, especially when we are dealing with emergent conditions like this. We should be ready to compromise and we should not forget that we are one family. There were a couple of suggestions I wanted to make, but I am afraid it is too late for me to attempt to do it in two or three minutes.

Mr. GARDINER: Take an extra five minutes.

Mr. MANION: I will drop some of it. My first suggestion is that we should work out, not just an emergency plan as this government is attempting to do or as we attempted to do in the first break-out of the emergency, but a long range plan to deal with the west over a period of years. We should attempt to work out a plan which would be just to the west and just to the rest of the country. This plan should not cost too much if at all possible. All reasonable men realize that there is a limit to what the country can continue to pay. We have a huge railway deficit, we have heavy relief costs, we have other costs in connection with wheat, and so on. All these run into huge amounts of money and there is a limit to what we can do in that way. That is, unless our hon. friends the social creditors prove to be right and we are able to turn out a large amount of money. However, I do not agree with their theory. I believe that under the present economic system we cannot go on indefinitely with huge deficits, and I submit that we should attempt to work out a long range plan in consultation with the farmers and farmers' organizations to assist our agriculturists. In arriving at this plan we should keep in view some of the ideas of my hon. friends such as insurance against crop failure and so on.