

agreement have reserved the right to have the matter settled in the first instance by their respective parliaments. They draw attention to the fact that they cannot speak for their parliaments, that legislation may be required to implement the agreement, and that, therefore, they cannot undertake to carry out a promise they have given conditionally. But suppose they could make a promise; can anyone say how they are going to control intensiveness of cultivation even if the areas are kept the same? And suppose these wheat importing countries were to reduce their tariffs, the tariff being excessively high, 180 per cent in one case, they might bring down their tariffs by a very large percentage, say 50 per cent, without its having much effect so far as Canada's wheat exports are concerned. It is for that kind of bargain we are to undertake to limit wheat acreage in Canada, and up to the present time wheat has been regarded as the very gold of our country, as its most essential product. All our efforts in past years have been towards helping to settle the prairies with those who will grow grain, because Canada grows the best wheat in the world.

I want to ask the Prime Minister a question which is being asked throughout the three western provinces. I know that this question is being asked because I happened to be there at the time the wheat agreement was being discussed. By what authority does he bind this country in the matter of any agricultural policy without allowing the House of Commons to have a single word to say in regard to it? That is the question western farmers are asking themselves, and which Canadians generally are asking themselves. What is the good of having a House of Commons if a prime minister is to be free while abroad to call together the representatives of different countries and enter into an agreement on behalf of Canada which alters our whole agricultural policy and without the House of Commons of Canada having any say in the matter one way or the other? We hear about emergency measures and the government having been given authority to deal with emergent conditions. How long is this emergency going to last? It started in 1930 and everything done in that year was along emergency lines. The government had to be given exceptional powers because there was an emergency. The same thing occurred again in 1931, again in 1932, and again in 1933. Now, in 1934, we are to have more emergency measures proposed by the government. They are proceeding as though they were an executive endowed with special authority because

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

of an emergency equivalent to war. It is time we should realize that what there is of an emergency in Canada has arisen because of the government's own policies. We have this emergent condition because of the policies the government has been putting in force. Before new policies are decided upon, this House of Commons should have the right to discuss them to the fullest possible extent.

I want to go a step further. How is the agreement to be carried out? As I have pointed out, its terms are absurd enough in themselves. Some of the countries which have signed have not entered into any real obligation. There is one country which has refused to be bound in the matter of its exports. What country is that? It is the country from which we have been told we have the most to fear, namely, Russia. Russia is to be free to export to any other country, but Canada is not. Russia is to be free to develop her wheat lands while the people who have settled upon our western plains have to cut down their cultivation. I ask if this is the way in which Canada is to hold her place among the nations of the world? I ask is Canadian agriculture to be handicapped to the advantage of agriculture in Russia, of which we have heard so much from hon. gentlemen opposite?

Where did this idea come from? It is an imitation of legislation which has been enacted by the country to the south. The United States has had a policy of restricting production.

Mr. McINTOSH: Copying Washington.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Copying Washington—imitating them, however, in regard to the worst features, and carefully avoiding what to the agriculturists in the United States is the best feature. What is the position in the United States? In that country something like eighty per cent of the wheat grown is consumed within the country itself. It is possible to regulate conditions in the United States. Eighty per cent of our grain is exported. What has the United States done? It has placed a tax upon wheat milled in the United States and is giving the proceeds of that tax to the farmers as compensation for their losses through a reduction in their areas of production. Is anything of the kind proposed by the present administration? Are our farmers to be compensated? Is the administration going to levy a tax in some direction and give the proceeds to the farmers of western Canada or of other parts of the country whose production areas are being reduced? Are they going to compensate