

But the minister condemns them to produce under conditions that will not provide a decent standard of living. It is all very well to say that we owe something to the prairie people, but surely the least that can be done is to provide such regulations or enact such legislation as will enable the majority of them to live in decency. That, I think, is not possible under this legislation. The other day when the minister was pleading for his present legislation, it seemed to me that the very arguments which he used would be far more favourable to an 80 cent minimum than to the 70 cent minimum.

Seventh, the east cannot disregard the west. Sometimes the east does not altogether understand the peculiar problems of the west. But if it fails to care for the west and its needs at the present time, the east will suffer with the west.

One other quotation from this report of the conference on markets for western farm products, at page 7:

Let us hope it will be remembered that in the course of producing these commodities the people of the prairie provinces can be large consumers of Canadian made goods, goods that will be necessary to support their large scale production and maintain their 500,000 homes. Both as important producers and important consumers the prairie provinces have possibilities of continuing to be a great national asset to Canada.

The eastern people must remember that exports must be paid for by imports. The eastern people, particularly manufacturers, cannot have it both ways. They are afraid to allow goods into this country, but goods must come into this country if we are to export goods from this country. If we cease to do that we are tied up to a domestic market and if it is impossible for us to export goods from the west the domestic market in the west will vanish.

After all, this is not the first time in the history of Canada that we have bonused certain industries. For many years, through the tariff, we have bonused certain producers, largely the manufacturing producers. Ever since the first line of rails was put through the west we have bonused the great transportation interests. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning) has just introduced a bill which, if I understand it, is proposing to bonus certain groups of financiers through his mortgage bank. Why then, if that should be considered advisable, should we not bonus the primary producers of this country? I think we are reaching a point where even the Liberals, at least those who still adhere to the old *laissez-faire* policy, will have to recognize that the old policies will no longer work. I think the very

fact that we are proceeding to bonus industry in this country is in itself an indication of the break-down of the present economic system. For a while we may possibly avoid something of the distress and dislocation which seems to be on the way, but I fancy it will be only a question of time until we shall have to face some radical changes in our whole system. At the present time I cannot see that as a nation we should neglect one of the most important sections of our community, a section upon which the welfare of our country seems so directly dependent.

Mr. WILLIAM HAYHURST (Vegreville): In following the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Woodsworth), I must say it is his concluding remarks that induce me to take part in this debate at all, because I feel that the political aspect of this subject is unimportant, that what we are really vitally interested in is the farmers of the west. Their problems are our problems; we are suffering from the cause of their suffering, the poverty of our people. So it seems to me that many of the speeches to which we have listened, particularly those taken from books, are rather deplorable. I do not see why I should have to listen to all these books being read; I can read them in my own office. Some of these professors say you cannot raise wheat for less than \$1.50 a bushel. Certainly you cannot do it in a book. Some practical farmers can raise wheat for 50 cents a bushel on the farm. For many years my wife and I—she, being an American, is the farmer rather than I, an Englishman—raised wheat for a great deal less than \$1.50, and we were very happy and prosperous until we left the farm to teach, in order that the family might go to school. Now, I must confess, I find it exceedingly unprofitable to run a farm from a distance.

Mr. MICHAUD: Back to the land.

Mr. HAYHURST: That is a wonderful movement. I think it is a bad thing if we bring into this House of Commons ideas which will pit the east against the west, the northern sections of Alberta against the southern sections, or the northern sections of Saskatchewan against the southern sections. The people in my area are mostly small farmers. I have one farmer who puts in 1,200 acres of wheat, but that is by far the largest farm in my constituency. Most of the farmers have only a half-section; many have only a quarter-section, and if in any year they have a thousand bushels of wheat to sell they consider themselves exceptionally fortunate. So when we read in these bills that 5,000 bushels is the