

remember that in the early days a frost would come for one or two hours in the early morning and as a result whole fields of grain would be unfit for anything. Thanks to our experimental farms and to other research work we now have earlier ripening wheat and improved methods of cultivation, with the result that wheat can safely be grown very much further north than was formerly possible. To-day it may almost be said that frost as a serious cause of damage is a thing of the past. But when that difficulty was overcome, other things came along, such as the grasshopper plague. I have had three or four crops destroyed by these insects, and I speak with some knowledge of their activities and what they can do. The grasshopper lives in hot, dry countries. In cold, wet seasons we are not troubled with them very much. Also, summer-fallow land, or land which has been summer-fallowed during the previous year, is a protection against grasshoppers; they will not lay their eggs in the soft soil, and you can safely sow your crop in the summer-fallow without expecting to have grasshoppers to contend with; all you have to do is to scatter poison around the edges of the summer-fallow to prevent them from migrating on to that land or into the crop as they will be doing about this time of the year. As regards stubble land, land where you had stubble last year and which you expect to put in crop this year, the grasshoppers will lay their eggs in that land if you have not worked your stubble the previous fall. All that is necessary is to cultivate the land in the fall of the year in order to destroy these nests of grasshoppers in the stubble, otherwise there will be grasshopper eggs all over the land and you will not be able to keep them down even though you put out lots of poison. I would advise anyone who intends to summer-fallow land to begin on the outside and plow in, leave a narrow strip in the centre and scatter poison for grasshoppers in that narrow strip.

The grasshopper pest promises this year to be one of the severest we have ever had in western Canada. This legislation will probably take care of people who are in that area and may lose their crops because of these insects. It is one of the justifications for the acreage bonus that it will assist people in such areas.

Besides grasshoppers, the west has had to contend with drought. In 1932, 1933 and 1934 I spoke in this house and asked for assistance for people in the drought area. Over a period of ten years, beginning in 1929 and lasting until 1939, we have had no crops in the area

in which I live—nine crop failures due to drought, and one due to rust. We asked the former government to provide and supervise assistance and to put in a prairie farm rehabilitation project, but it was only during the last year they were in power that they saw fit to do so. Since then the program has been enlarged, and magnificent work is being done; make no mistake about that. We are doing our best to retain the water from snows and rain and prevent it from running off into the Hudson bay or the gulf of Mexico. Big irrigation projects are good things and are to be commended, but the small dam, the small irrigation project which takes care of a half an acre or an acre or two or three acres on the single farm, is the best type of project; it is the one which is doing the most good. It is the people living in that drought area who will be benefited by the acreage bonus, the assistance given under this bill.

We in the west have had many other things to contend with. One of them is rust. We hope that this year rust is a thing of the past, because we now have rust-resistant wheat, thanks to the experimental farms and to the work done in our rust laboratories and elsewhere.

It is the people who have been contending with these difficulties that this bill is intended to help. It ensures that they will have some assistance. If you like, it is in the nature of a relief bill. But anybody who has lived in a district such as mine, where ninety-five per cent of the farmers are on relief, knows what relief has done to their morale. It has destroyed the morale of the farmers in the district; and if this bill has no other effect than to do away with relief measures, it is justified on that ground and that alone. A man with a family of five living in the drought area receives, if he is getting full relief, including coal, clothing and food, \$250 to \$260 a year. Under this bill he is guaranteed somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$300, but he will be self-reliant, he will be depending upon himself and upon his own knowledge and efforts, and that more than anything else is what we need. What has happened to our farmers there is the same as has happened to the men in the cities who are on relief. It cannot be helped, but we are anxious to get away from that condition and to put our people back into a situation where they will be self-reliant and self-dependent. Even upon that ground alone this measure is justified.

I now wish to refer for a moment to Bill No. 63. This measure sets the guaranteed