

wheat; Europe would like to eat wheat, and Britain is eating wheat from foreign countries at this very time. The countries of Europe, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, the Scandinavian countries, are all pleading for bread; and even under the Red Cross, with the help of the United States, they cannot get it. I ask, is it not a good time for us to prepare for a full bread-basket? Would it not be better to spend even \$100,000,000 instead of \$35,000,000, if it were necessary for the purpose, so as to keep these farmers going, to keep body and soul together, and to give them a reasonable price for their wheat?

As the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) well said the other night, this is not the policy that Joseph followed when he built storehouses. This is a short-sighted political policy, which has very little merit in it except to please some people in the industry by saying to them, "In a few years when people are short of bread and the children of Europe are in crying need of it, the farmers will be able to collect a big price." Our boys are flying over the English channel; many of them are risking their lives at this very moment, and as I said last year, this country might well give 100,000,000 bushels away and pay for it out of the treasury. I would as soon feed the children of Europe when the proper time comes, and vote in support of such a proposal, as I would vote for the shells that will win the war, because it is all in the larger scheme.

When we are voting \$1,300,000,000, why stop at \$35,000,000? You will not stop there anyhow. It is a paltry sum. For the sake of Britain, for the sake of our own country's future prestige, I appeal to the government and say to them, "Do not let it be said that we summer-fallowed while our boys were dying for their country. Do not let it be said that while the Prime Minister of Great Britain was pleading for huge supplies of foodstuffs, we actually paid our farmers to refrain from producing, paid them to do nothing, so that there might be a shortage of wheat in a few years and they might get higher prices."

When did a surplus of foodstuffs ever lose a war? Far from having a surplus, we will have a huge shortage; we will have an empty treasury in this country. We are wondering what we are going to do. We are going to tax our people to the limit; we are, perhaps, going to increase the income tax. We may increase other taxes and almost strangle industry. We are going to change the standard of living of the people, and on top of all that, before the war is over we may have to borrow a billion dollars from another country.

An hon. MEMBER: Where from?

Mr. ROWE: "Where from?" some one asks. I am not going to enter into that question now. The hon. member knows we can get it, because this country is rich, and it will not hurt our credit even if we do borrow a billion dollars so long as we have our granaries full. It will not hurt us to have our granaries full of unsold wheat; it will not hurt our credit to build storage facilities, but it will hurt us if we cease producing and face the possibility of an ensuing drought. In another country they killed pigs one year and paid exorbitant prices for them the following year, and the same with cattle. We have seen countries plough under cotton and burn coffee; we have seen them deliberately destroy foodstuffs, and this fantastic new policy is no different in principle from the ploughing under of wheat. I urge upon the government that, with a view to meeting post-war needs, they do not persist in this policy.

Who knows what the weather will be next year? Who knows but we may face the most terrible drought we have ever had in this country? We have in this bill a provision for paying \$4 to summer-fallow, \$2 for sowing oats and barley, and \$2 for sowing grasses. Well, that is what the farmers should do anyhow. That is what we do in old Ontario, and if it is good for one province it ought to be good for another. We grow coarse grains in Ontario and produce live stock and live stock products in vast quantities, and what is sound for one part of the country ought to be sound for another. Under this bill a man can make twice as much for doing nothing as for doing something. After all, oats and barley are little different from wheat, regarded as feed. I have fed hogs and dairy cattle on wheat, and this grain may be classified as a feed product. I would as soon grow wheat for feed as barley. In Ontario they get sixty pounds to the bushel, and hogs will fatten on it. We can make animal fats. If the minister is anxious to help the farmers, then I assure him that the farmers in Quebec and Ontario would be very glad to feed a great deal more wheat. They could produce animal fats to take the place of vegetable oils that are now entering Canada. The treasury would make a great deal of money, and the farmers would collect \$12,000,000 or \$15,000,000 more. That would be something constructive.

We are told that we should not go to the United States except on business; that our wives and daughters should not go there. They are not going there to any great extent, but we are trying to encourage tourist traffic to Canada. Our United States friends are coming to this country, and they will be helping us in that regard. We are saving money, or we are trying to save money, with a view to conserving exchange; and yet this