

was for the well-being of the western farmer and the whole class of wheat producers, it should only cease being in effect when repealed. It has not been repealed to this day. During the season just ended the farmer has had no opportunity to sell his wheat to the board unless the price dropped below 90 cents. That was not the purpose of the statute. The purpose was exactly the opposite; it was to afford the farmer an opportunity to sell. He was to be given a market to which he could go and take his chance upon the price rising. There were many farmers who believed that the market would rise and they would have liked to sell their crop to the board. They were denied that privilege unless the price of wheat dropped below 90 cents. If wheat went up they could not participate except by holding their wheat, whereas the statute provided that a second method should be provided in addition to the open market. The statute stated that the board should buy all the wheat offered at a fixed price and issue certificates which would enable the farmer to participate in a rise in the market.

Compare the price the board got for its wheat with the price of wheat to-day. This is not the time to go into this matter in detail, but I ask this question: Would any intelligent body of shareholders accept such a statement from their directors? Hon. members may ask: What were the conditions? Every man must have realized those conditions. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Euler) must have known what were the conditions. We find that the world's net exports of wheat, as supplied by the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome and by our own bureau, amounted last year to only 514,283,000 bushels. The year before the total was 526,326,000 bushels odd; the year before, 542,699,000 bushels and the year before, 616,830,000 bushels. Last year I pointed out in this house that there was a partial failure of the crop in the Argentine. Let us look at the export figures for the Argentine. They are:

	bushels
1928-29	221,627,000
1929-30	150,599,000
1930-31	124,107,000
1931-32	140,293,000
1932-33	132,044,000
1933-34	146,719,000
1934-35	181,202,000
1935-36	69,419,000

Those figures must have been known to everyone interested. Notwithstanding these facts, the government of this country prevented the farmers from selling their crops

to the board unless the price dropped below 90 cents. This was done at a time when the exports from the Argentine had dropped to 69,000,000 bushels. Do you mean to tell me, sir, that any reasonable body of shareholders would excuse a board of directors for actions such as that?

Then I turn to another item, that with reference to the United States of America. What were they doing in that country? In 1928-29, they sold 145,000,000 bushels; in 1929-30, 138,000,000 bushels; in 1930-31, 109,000,000 bushels and in 1933-34, 25,000,000 bushels. They had no wheat to sell last year or the year before. Other countries were in about the same position so far as exports were concerned. Notwithstanding these facts the government of this country deprived the farmers of western Canada of the right to sell their wheat to the board. What right had they to do that? That is question number one.

Show me their power. They have repealed the statute by order in council, but what would have happened if we had done that? All the books on public finance and all the safeguards that have been achieved since the time of Caesar would have been referred to in order to show that we were wrecking the British constitution. There you have it. I leave it to the government to explain why the market that was provided by statute was not made available to the farmers of western Canada. This statute was to enable them to get a minimum price and thereafter to share in the rising market which everyone knew was coming. There was a limitation of the quantities available for export from the producing countries in the world and yet our farmers were deprived of that market by order in council. I should like to know why.

It is somewhat gratifying to see the methods which have been indulged in by the government during recent months. Does the Minister of Labour (Mr. Rogers) remember that we pointed out to him that he might have to have money? He had made no provision for that. Does the Prime Minister remember his references to distinguished economists and financiers who pointed out that there should be no distribution of moneys except by appropriation of parliament? Does he remember how the vials of wrath were poured out upon the heads of those who sat upon the treasury benches of that day because they had provided that with the will of parliament they could take from the consolidated fund for relief purposes such moneys as might be necessary? How has it been done by the Minister of Labour? How has it been done by the Minister of