

the west have a very difficult problem on their hands, a problem which from all appearances they will have for some time to come. We have had our markets contracted; we have lost many markets, in my opinion entirely because of this extreme nationalism we had in this country and the higher tariffs we imposed. Whether we like it or not, those markets are gone, and I believe we should try to find some other uses for our wheat than grinding it into flour. I think our research laboratories should try to find some other way to use our grain. I should like to offer this suggestion, which was made in the agriculture committee, that the government consider the advisability of taking feed wheat, No. 6 northern and No. 5 northern, grinding it into feed and calling it No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 feed. Do not let it be ground into flour at all; do not let it be exported, because it only destroys the value of our good wheats in the markets of the world. Let us feed this wheat to our cattle, our pigs and our chickens and take it off the market.

Mr. PERLEY: Who really suggested that to the agriculture committee?

Mr. DONNELLY: I could not say at the moment; it was suggested to the committee.

Mr. PERLEY: I think the hon. member was present the day I suggested it.

Mr. DONNELLY: We have been advancing that suggestion for the last five or six years.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): The hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell) suggested the same thing.

Mr. DONNELLY: It has been suggested for a very considerable period, and I am advancing the suggestion once more to-day.

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I am sure the people of the constituency of Wood Mountain will be pleased to read the speech to which we have just listened, because from my experience in the southern part of Saskatchewan those people are in dire need of something along the line of crop insurance. I would suggest to the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Donnelly) that it has never been implied in any shape or form from this corner of the house that the people in southern Saskatchewan should not have crop insurance. We believe very strongly that those people, as well as farmers all over the dominion, should have such insurance, but what we do take exception to is that under this legislation the people of southern Saskatchewan are going to be taken off relief at the expense of the rest of the three prairie provinces.

[Mr. Donnelly.]

It is interesting to note that very few Liberals, and only one Conservative, have taken part in this debate. I believe that is outstanding—

An hon. MEMBER: Two Conservatives.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): One and a half or two. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley) presented a very good argument, but so far as I know it was the only argument that has come from the Conservatives. Likewise I believe there has been only one good argument presented by the Liberals, and I think that should be noted because I have before me a Saskatchewan Liberal newspaper of recent date which states that the Liberals are vigorously protesting against this policy. I have not heard any such protests so far. While I am on the subject, I can imagine the enthusiasm of the people of Edmonton West when they read the vigorous protest of the hon. member for that constituency (Mr. MacKinnon) in regard to this wheat legislation; I am sure they are going to be tickled to death with it.

I have been wondering just why the government introduced such legislation, and I am sure almost every one is wondering the same thing. I have gone carefully over the speeches that have been delivered in this house, but as yet I have not discovered any reason presented by the Liberals as to why the price to the farmers should be 37 cents. On February 16 the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) spoke at some length in regard to this matter, and I read his speech in an endeavour to discover why the figure was set at 60 cents, but without success. Neither, so far as I know, has he given any reason whatever for advancing the price from 60 to 70 cents. There must be some valid reason for jumping the price 10 cents. If the farmers were getting enough at 60 cents I say they have no right to get 70 cents. If on the other hand 70 cents is not sufficient they should get 95 cents. I challenge anyone in this house to tell me why the figure has been raised from 60 to 70 cents.

Mr. GARDINER: It has not been changed in Bill 82; it is still 60 cents.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): That is what it is going to be after the next election, but until the election comes along it will be 70 cents.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Even that will be better than the promise you made, of \$25 a month.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow-River): If this Liberal government will keep hands off of