

If it is correct that we can only dispose of 200,000,000 bushels, including empire and foreign markets, then we are in an extremely difficult position with regard to the marketing of our surplus grain. It means that the western farmers will find themselves in the position of having to curtail their production, if it is to be done by one stroke of the pen, to something like 60,000,000 bushels, whereas we grow something like 400,000,000 bushels in a normal year.

Not only that, but we are also in a difficult position with regard to almost every commodity. The Prime Minister took considerable satisfaction from the fact that within the last month pork and bacon selects had risen to 10 cents a pound in eastern Canada. Do you know what I sold my hogs for this fall? I sold them for \$4.20, and I was glad to get it. Last year I sold them for \$2.

An hon. MEMBER: Keep them.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): How can you keep them? Every farmer knows that the moment they get over 220 pounds you are docked, so you have to sell them as soon as they are ready. We have a rigorous climate out there, and we have to try to get our hogs on the market before the cold weather sets in, so we are forced to take these prices. I see distress and suffering among my neighbours, and I may tell the Prime Minister that I take mighty little satisfaction from the fact that temporarily the price of hogs has gone up. As soon as we begin to produce we will find the price go down to the old level. I hope it will not; I should be glad to see it remain at ten cents, and in fact I would be glad to get five cents.

Mr. DUFF: The farmer does not get ten cents.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, of course he does not, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) is going to rectify that by means of the inquiry which is to be made, and which is necessary because of the action of this government in putting these individuals in a preferred position. I want to tell my right hon. friend that I hope he attacks the question as vigorously as he promised to do in 1930, when he said that if any individual sought to take advantage of the protection afforded him the government would see that redress was given at once. This has been going on for three years; in a moderate way it is going on right now and I am waiting to see what kind of redress we are going to get. If we do not get redress

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

at once; if it runs on for another six months or so we will not need redress, because we will all be out of business.

I see where one particularly optimistic individual says that it all depends upon the farmer, that on one side of the road he has known a man to become wealthy while the man on the other side of the road was a complete failure. Well, I have seen a few cases of that kind, but by and large the farmer needs all the assistance he can get in a very difficult occupation. Mighty few of them make more than a reasonable competence out of a lifetime of toil. My hon. friends who live in Ontario know that. I have been engaged in farming all my life, and I know something about it. At present I am not in a particularly unfortunate position, but that is not due to the receipts from my farm, which have had to be bolstered on many occasions. When hon. gentlemen tell me that the farmers of western Canada are responsible for many of their difficulties I can only say that I wish they would go out and address a farm gathering in the west when they do. I notice that they stick pretty religiously to the urban centres.

I have lived in western Canada for over twenty-six years, Mr. Speaker, and I have never known the people to be so incensed as they are to-day. They are willing to consider anything, even sovietism, if it will change the situation, and they are not going to be uncooed any longer. When they get an opportunity to express themselves hon. gentlemen opposite will understand in what high regard they are held by the farming community of western Canada.

On motion of Mr. Thompson (Lanark) the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT: The business to-morrow will be to take the order paper as it is.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What does that mean; shall we take up the address?

Mr. BENNETT: No, just as the business is on the order paper. To-morrow is private members' day.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I notice that this year the debate on the address appears on the order paper under the head of public bills and orders, and I believe that for the first month of the session public bills and orders have precedence on Thursday. Do I understand, then, that the debate on the address will go on to-morrow?