

government. I think we instituted much of it. That certainly is an assistance to the west, because I happen to know very well how, when I was Minister of Railways and Canals, one could take coal from Cleveland to Fort William, right up the great lakes, for as low as 17 cents a ton, whereas we were bonusing coal from the west to bring it to the east for the purpose of assisting the west.

Mr. YOUNG: If the duty were put on high enough, coal could be brought from the west.

Mr. MANION: That is another question. I will not get off the track on another subject. That brings up a hypothetical question. No government with any common sense at all would put a duty of \$5 or \$6 a ton on coal.

Mr. YOUNG: It is just about as sane as some of the tariffs we have on now.

Mr. MANION: It may be, but the fact that my hon. friend suggests it, does not make it particularly sane. I am pointing out these facts, not with any idea of criticising. I am merely trying to show the west that the east has done these things, and that it has done them willingly. I have mentioned the bonus on wheat. The Hudson Bay railway cost \$53,000,000, and it certainly has not been a success. It was done at the demand of the west. Then there was wheat assistance, which the minister has in his bill, and which we, in our time, carried out to a large extent. Then there was drought assistance, seed wheat, and relief. I merely mention these points.

I repeat that I am not making these observations in any spirit of criticism. I say the east has done all those things with the utmost willingness. There may have been the occasional individual who criticised it, but the vast majority of men, from whatever section of Canada they may come, are perfectly satisfied to help the west, and I think they should be. I repeat that we are one big family. When the west is in difficulty, it is the duty of the east to help the west. I agree with that principle, and I mention those items merely because they are compensations which have gone back to the west, to a certain extent, for the assistance the west has given the people of this great country through the loss it has made on tariffs. Undoubtedly the west has had some loss, but nothing like the losses which are charged at times.

The west, depending upon wheat, must be helped in an emergency such as this. I would point out that when in power from 1930 to 1935 the government of which I was a member recognized that fact. I believe I could

[Mr. Manion.]

illustrate by giving some of the items very briefly. We gave a bonus on wheat to which the minister referred a few moments ago, of five cents a bushel. I thought it was given in 1932, but he said it was 1931. However, it was in our term of office.

Mr. GARDINER: I am not certain.

Mr. MANION: It was either in 1931 or 1932. It cost something between \$12,000,000 and \$13,000,000. Then, in the estimates we gave tens of millions of dollars for relief in drought areas and rightly so. Those tens of millions of dollars were given to Manitoba, Alberta, and particularly Saskatchewan. Then we set up a stabilization operation under John I. McFarland. I wish to say here and now what has not been said, and I think should be said, that I believe the west had in John I. McFarland a friend such as few sections of this country have ever had. In John I. McFarland they had a big, broad-minded Canadian, who gave his services free, who got no remuneration for them. He did dare to serve the west and, as the results show, he deserves the gratitude of the whole of Canada. The work he did for the west in stabilization operations is estimated, and I think justly so, as having been worth to the western farmer about \$100,000,000, and it is pointed out that western farmers had that much more in their pockets than they would have had if the stabilization operations of Mr. McFarland and our government had not been carried out. Those operations were carried out at a profit of more than nine and one-half million dollars.

I wish now to refer to the speeches delivered by the minister not only to-night but on other occasions. They seemed to me to imply on various occasions that there was a loss in the operations of John I. McFarland. If I am misquoting him I should like to have him correct me.

Mr. GARDINER: I did not say that. As a matter of fact, I said before that the first loss the federal government had taken on wheat was in 1935.

Mr. MANION: I accept the minister's statement, and I am glad to have him make the correction. I have no desire whatever to misrepresent what he has said. But frankly speaking, when the minister spoke on April 5, he left the impression, at least with me, that he was referring to the stabilization wheat of John I. McFarland. I admit that in 1935 there was a loss. But on the whole operations of Mr. McFarland, according to page 100 of