

would be very foolish to oppose it from any consideration whatsoever. It seems that during the debate thus far a good many members have taken pains to point out to the minister how long ago it was that they or their party began to advocate this particular principle. Probably it would be well for me to say just a word on this score also. When social credit proposals were first advocated the great founder of the proposals, Major Douglas, advocated a just price. When the campaign was being waged in Alberta perhaps the most attractive aspect of the campaign was the second principle of social credit, that of the just price. This is exactly the principle which apparently the minister and his department have been aiming to establish in this bill.

There are three principles of social credit. The first one is the free flow of credit; the second one is the just price, and the third one is the issue of consumers' purchasing power in the form of a dividend or in some other form that would increase the purchasing power. This principle was apparently actuating the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he introduced his bill with regard to family allowances.

I do not wish to bore the house or the country by elaborating once more that the objectives which the government is aiming at in most of the legislation which is coming forth now are the objectives which were clearly indicated as desirable objectives by the social credit movement many years ago, as long ago as 1923; and if those objectives had been recognized as sound in those days and had been greeted with any sort of respect instead of universal derision, doubt and disrespect by the Liberal party, conditions in Canada would have been far different from what they have been.

May I now raise one question to which I believe the minister should give a great deal of attention? In his well planned and informative speech this morning he drew to our attention the fact that in 1927 the income of the farm population of Canada was \$934 million; in 1929 it was \$926.7 million, and in 1932 it was \$383.5 million. If he takes the last figure from either of the two other figures he will have a sum in the neighbourhood of \$600 million. It will be a most interesting mathematical problem for the minister to give the members of the cabinet, and also his department, as to how the difference between \$383.5 million and more than \$900 million could be met in any year by the expenditure of \$200 million. I think it must be apparent that to deal with a national problem anything

like that which confronted Canada in 1932, this figure of \$200 million is pathetically inadequate.

Another question which I think needs to be asked right at this point is, where is it proposed to get this money? If we are to have money for family allowances, for re-establishment, for servicing a debt of over fourteen billion dollars, and so on, this is a really serious question to ask. Where is the money to come from?

Another important question is raised by the bill. It may not be exactly involved in the measure, but certainly it is associated with it. Where are the markets to be found for the produce which will be available as a result of these measures which are designed to stimulate the production of agricultural commodities? Are these markets to be found abroad, or are we to depend upon the home population for our market? It seems to me that this matter must be given a great deal of earnest thought. Suppose the foreign market should be found quite inadequate to absorb the generous production of agricultural products which most certainly will result from a sincere application of the principles contained in this bill. What devices would be adopted by the government to deal with a situation which would leave vast surpluses of a wide variety of commodities on the Canadian market, with all the disruptive effects on prices that would naturally result from such surpluses? I think this matter ought to be given a great deal of attention, and no doubt the minister will discuss it in considerable detail when the bill is in committee. We shall be listening to what he has to say. Once more may I suggest that, if foreign markets fail, the home market can be expanded to any degree desirable by the use of a dividend, and I would suggest to the minister that the sooner he gets his colleagues in the cabinet to discuss with him quite earnestly the matter of a dividend and how it can be paid in Canada, the sooner he will be placing the whole economy in Canada on something like a sound foundation.

So far as I have been able to discover in reading the bill, nothing is said as to what is to be done with respect to the cost of production of the various commodities. Very likely provision is being made somewhere else in this regard, but as yet I have not discovered it. The cost of production is a matter that has greatly embarrassed the farmers of western Canada. Anyone who has followed with care the reports of the Searle Grain company and has seen therein the statement of the rising costs of the commodities farmers have to buy, will have been impressed with the fact that between 1914 and 1935 the cost of the 147