

—I do not think they are very important or they would have been read. But the bad things are so overwhelmingly greater than the good things that when the vote comes we will certainly know which way to vote.

In order to get the proper setting for this blundering budget I will have to take the house back for a year or two. It is admitted that the government has made many heroic if futile attempts to aid agriculture. They have been both persistent and heroic but in large measure quite unsuccessful. I am going to recite some of these major blunders that have been made from time to time. I am not going to commend the government because they merely made the attempt to assist agriculture; the attempt to be any good must be successful and most of these heroics were foredoomed to failure from the very outset.

In the budget of June, 1931, the Prime Minister outlined some assistance that was going to be given to the wheat farmers by the railways absorbing five cents per bushel of the freight charges on Canadian wheat. That proposal was temporarily abandoned in favour of payment of this five-cent bonus to the exporter on all exported wheat. For two solid months less two days this Liberal opposition from early morning until dewy eve asked that this sum be given direct to the farmer rather than through the questionable medium of the exporter. It took us that length of time to convert the government to our view of the little likelihood of it never finding its way back to the producer, but finally the Prime Minister became converted and adopted our suggestion. Yet in the face of that conversion he now establishes a new fund all of which goes through the same exporter avenue that they themselves virtually condemned and departed from two years ago. And they ask us now to throw up our sweaty caps and cheer for an institution of that kind—last year's caps too, by the way, because we cannot afford a new one this year. But even after adopting the giving the five-cents bonus direct to the farmer, the government gave it to the farmer who needs it least, a Christmas box sometimes running up to \$1,000 per grower and aggregating over \$12,000,000, and then open a loan and collection department to deal with the poor fellow who had no crop; an order given and a note signed before they get enough to put in their eye and see any the worse for it. That is the kind of treatment the no-crop or little-crop farmers of Saskatchewan get, with respect to which the Prime Minister spoke with such eloquence on the first of July, 1931. A national calamity had struck western Canada, he declared. We were enthralled by his eloquence

[Mr. Motherwell.]

and humanity and what he was going to do for this calamity-stricken portion of Saskatchewan. But the Prime Minister is frequently great on profession and light on performance. He gave generously, to those who needed it least, and those who needed it most he treated in the way I have described and absolutely refused to distribute any bonus on an acreage basis so that it would reach those who had the misfortune to have no crop.

So we condemn the government on these counts; first, that the payment was first to be through the exporter; second, that when they did adopt the proper method they gave the money to those who needed it least and withheld it from those who needed it most, but gave them a loan and then within six months insisted on having half of it paid, although it was only contracted the previous six months. To-day those farmers, or many of them, are stripped barer than the day they were born because they were pressed to pay through the Saskatchewan relief commission on behalf of this federal government those loans and seed grain advances that they needed themselves to live on through this hard winter. The next blunder was the Stamp commission. I am in favour of commissions, but there are commissions and commissions. This was a good commission too, but before the report got through this house word went out that there was an appendix that should be taken out. Instead of using the proper surgical appliances to do it, instead of having a clever surgical operation, they asked us to tear it out ruthlessly with our bare fists. And it was torn out. Mine is in yet, because I want it to use before my audiences—I mean the appendix in my copy of the report, not in myself. Then we had the inquiry before the agriculture committee with respect to Garnet wheat. I do not know what possessed the government to take the attitude they did against one of the best wheats we ever developed. Our export trade shows to-day, and our customers on the other side say that there never was a time in the history of Canada when our wheat was more acceptable than it is at this moment. Yet we have 35,000,000 bushels of Garnet wheat, most of which goes to the Pacific as two Northern and No. 2 Pacific is one of the best selling wheats both in Europe and Great Britain to-day. However, I can congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce upon having seemingly receded from that untenable position, and having regard to that I will not press the point further.

Then as to the world grain conference and exhibition. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) appeared rather to disadvantage in con-