

of fifty million. These great men were looking ahead. They were not worrying about whether or not we might have a little surplus of food-stuffs. They had no fear as to our potentialities as a great industrial nation as well as a wheat growing country, a great producer of live stock as well as of flour.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the committee for having listened so attentively. In all seriousness, and not in a political sense at all, I say this government should stop, look and listen. Look at the signs of the times and ask yourselves again if you think it is wise to provide an amount of \$35,000,000 which amount may be increased to \$100,000,000, in order to pay people for doing nothing, while this empire is pleading with us to fill up the bread-basket and be ready to receive those hungry people who will be anxious to come here after the war.

Mr. GARDINER: Before moving that the committee rise and report progress, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word in reply to the latter part of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, which were in elaboration of statements made earlier in the hon. gentleman's speech. There is no one on this side of the house, least of all the Minister of Trade and Commerce, or the Minister of Agriculture, who believes that this policy is putting anything into the pockets of the people of western Canada. When the hon. member makes a plea to the effect that someone in Canada should give up something in order that those engaged in fighting the war might have more with which to fight, I think he might choose a much better subject than the one on which he has been speaking for the last half hour. The farmers of western Canada know that this policy is not putting money into their pockets, whether the money comes from the treasury of Canada or from any other source. They know that this policy is taking money out of their pockets and making it possible for this dominion to finance the war to the extent of at least \$100,000,000 more than would be the case if the government did for the wheat growers of the west what they are doing for most of the other people of Canada.

We are not begging for the west. We are not asking members from any part of this country to put money into the pockets of the western wheat growers. The wheat producer of the west is denied the right to sell his wheat to Japan, Russia, Spain and many other countries with which we are not at war, in order to assist Britain in carrying out the blockade which, if it were not carried out, would result in the destruction of the empire and of democracy. That being so, we do not feel that we are asking this house for money to be distributed among the people of western

Canada. We are asking the people of this country—and we believe we have the support of at least ninety per cent of them—to help the farmers over one of the most difficult years they have ever experienced; and, in helping them, to lessen the need for the government to pay storage on large quantities of wheat. I quite agree with what was said the other day by the hon. member for Moose Jaw. This is the cheapest method of storing wheat that can be evolved. Under this method, moisture is stored in the ground, making it unnecessary to protect grain against mites and other kinds of damage; making it unnecessary to build storage facilities in order to keep the grain, and making certain that wheat can be grown when wheat is needed.

On this occasion, as on previous occasions, we in western Canada are not begging. With regard, however, to the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, I should like to say that during the six sessions I have been in this parliament I have never known him to support anything this government has proposed for western Canada. He is always prepared to do something else; never the thing that is proposed. He is prepared to spend \$100,000,000 to help the farmers of western Canada, but he has never suggested how he would like to spend that amount. He has only said that the way we were proposing to spend money was not the correct way, that he would like to have it done by some other method.

There is not time to say more this evening. In due course I shall deal with the remarks that have been made concerning the Prairie Farm Assistance Act and other criticisms which have been made. I shall, however, select another day, when there is sufficient time to deal with those matters.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What is the business on Monday?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): I understand there is an agreement that this debate will proceed on Monday.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not know of any agreement; the right hon. gentleman had better state his programme.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): If not, we shall go into supply, and of course the motion of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn) will be taken up. There seems, however, to be a feeling that this debate should continue, and we are absolutely in agreement with that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That suggestion was made.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe (Quebec East) the house adjourned at 6.05 p.m.