

Mr. PERLEY: Yes, they were valuable. If this bill passes in its present form there will be a yearly struggle to convince the government that it is necessary to establish a reasonable minimum or fixed price on each crop. I do not think we desire to bring about a condition where we will continually be having delegations coming to Ottawa for that purpose.

Mr. EULER: To what bill is my hon. friend referring?

Mr. PERLEY: I am referring to Bill No. 63.

Mr. EULER: Bill No. 63 definitely fixes the price, at least the advance payment.

Mr. PERLEY: No one will ever be satisfied with the figure in that bill. It has been changed once, and we are suggesting now that it be revamped again.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Is my hon. friend against the policy provided for in these bills?

Mr. PERLEY: I do not think the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross) even understands Bill No. 83. We will hear what he has to say when he speaks.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I am just asking the hon. member if he is in favour of or against these bills.

Mr. PERLEY: I am certainly not in favour of Bill No. 63.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley) has the floor and he should not be interrupted unless he gives consent.

Mr. PELLETIER: On a point of order, the house is not in committee, and when the hon. member is making a speech he should not be subjected to a cross-fire of questions from across the chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree with the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Pelletier), but great latitude is being allowed on these questions, although it must not be interpreted as a general rule.

Mr. PERLEY: I have no hesitation in answering the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross). I am certainly not in favour of Bill No. 63, or of Bill No. 83 considered other than as a relief or crop insurance measure. I do not think relief and crop insurance should be confused with the question of marketing.

The brief presented by the Bracken committee was a well considered presentation and set out the whole situation clearly and fairly.

[Mr. J. G. Ross.]

That committee certainly was not in favour of either bill. It dealt with production costs, the cost of marketing, and the return that is necessary to the farmer. There is nothing in that brief which I have not publicly advocated on several occasions both on the floor of this house and outside.

We had in 1930 and up to 1935 stabilization operations, and later the wheat board. When I was speaking on the budget I proposed a permanent plan, speaking more or less for myself, but I did not have time to conclude my remarks on that subject and I should like to say a word more now.

I had set out that the government should appoint a board, have a long range policy, and fix a price as well for coarse grains of export grade. In order to finance the proposition I would have the Minister of Finance through the Bank of Canada issue currency on the security of that wheat. I think he could do that to-day. I will agree with the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) and some others to the extent that when this country is holding 130 million bushels of wheat—and it might be a little more if my plan were adopted—currency could be issued on the security of that wheat to save any interest charges. The money thus put into circulation would increase the purchasing power of the farmer, the labourer, and the consumer. It would stabilize trade and industry, and help everyone in industry generally in Canada, if put into operation as a permanent national plan with all grains, including coarse grains, covered. The domestic price would then be set at \$120.

If I had time I could give statistics to show that there is nothing to fear from the adoption of such a plan. I have tables showing world production in 1928, when it was at its highest; the world's carry-over in 1933, the highest on record, around 1,200,000,000 bushels, and we may have that much this year. I have Canada's average production over thirteen years, 353 million bushels; the average carry-over, 101 million bushels; and the average exports for the last twelve years, 201 million bushels. I believe that history will repeat itself and that we shall return to that condition. Even if we have a large surplus this year I do not think there is anything to fear. If a proper committee were set up to investigate and advise as to a permanent plan such as I have suggested, I think it could be worked out.

In regard to these bills, Bill No. 83 in particular is more or less a relief or crop insurance measure. I do not think we should confuse that with marketing. The Liberals