

Mr. GARDINER: The hon. gentleman does not yet understand my statement. The 80 cent price contained in this bill is the price which would be established at Fort William on the world basis; it has nothing to do with the price the government sets. The government could allow this provision to operate even though we had set a price of 80 cents in Bill No. 63.

Mr. QUELCH: Well, I am sorry that the government did not see fit to set the price at 80 cents. I see my time is up, so I shall have to deal with the matter in committee. But there are several other clauses here which make it impossible for this measure as at present drafted to deal adequately with the constituency I represent, for instance, because 135 townships have to be affected before it is declared a crop failure area. On the other hand, all the farmers are compelled to contribute under this scheme. Supposing my constituency, which, I say, represents part of the permanent drought area, has 80 townships with less than 5 bushels an acre; they cannot come in under this bill.

Mr. GARDINER: Is it not just as fair that they should contribute in that way as that all the people of Canada should contribute to the 80 cent price?

Mr. QUELCH: So long as western Canada is contributing about \$100,000,000 to the rest of Canada, I maintain they are perfectly justified in demanding a few of those dollars back. Again I say, when you have a bill which makes it possible to have in a certain area 80 townships absolutely destitute that have been contributing to this scheme, and then be told, "Oh, that area is not big enough to become a federal responsibility, you will have to go on relief"—I say that is a very unfair bill.

I shall deal with that further in committee.

Mr. DONNELLY: If they harvest less than 5 bushels to the acre they get \$2.50 an acre.

Mr. QUELCH: Only if the area affected is a certain size.

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): We are endeavouring to wind up this session within the next week, at any rate by Saturday next. We are now considering bills as one might say in groups; we are really considering bills Nos. 63 and 83 together.

The minister in referring to the different measures introduced in these two bills in particular has on different occasions taken about six hours, five or more in this house and an hour in Regina in a broadcast, trying to explain to the Canadian public and more

particularly to the people in the west what he really means by these measures. And hon. members can judge the confusion that exists after listening to the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Quelch). I suppose he has read the bill a number of times; certainly he has seen it more often than any farmers in the west, and I judge hon. members would conclude that he is somewhat confused as to what these bills really mean.

Mr. MARTIN: That is the fault of the hon. member.

Mr. PERLEY: I would judge that he is of average intelligence, possibly a little above the average, so it is easy to understand how the rest of them feel. I regret that bills of such importance were not brought down earlier in the session in order that they might be properly considered, not in committee of the whole but by a committee of the house, possibly the committee on agriculture, which I think is a pretty good committee this year. To my mind this whole question is an economic one which must be considered in a fair and reasonable way and dealt with as a national problem. I have always tried to be constructive in any criticism I had to offer. I think the introduction of bills 63 and 83, together with the announcement by the minister on February 16 with regard to a change in agricultural policy, have disturbed the minds of the western people more than anything else ever presented to parliament. It is true that the bills have been revamped, following representations from all interests in the west, including the so-called Bracken committee. I am going to take a little bit of credit to myself for the changes that have been made, because Ontario was included under Bill 63 after I had made the suggestion in my speech on the budget.

Mr. EULER: I am afraid my hon. friend is flattering himself.

Mr. PERLEY: Well, if I did not give myself a little credit I am afraid I could not look to the other side for it. I was quite encouraged last night to hear the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) speak of the average prices for the last thirty years. I believe he is an optimist, as I am; and perhaps if he would revamp these bills once more he might embody my plan in them. Then we would get down to a reasonable way of handling this problem, and if the board operating such a scheme had a little courage I believe it could be put over. So the next time the bills are revamped I shall expect to see my plan included.