

discussion in committee has concluded. If that will meet the situation, I would undertake to say that the government will see that the hon. member is secured in this right.

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to interfere with any plans which the government may have in regard to the discussion of wheat. I have no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) wants to get this particular estimate through before the Easter adjournment. However, I am afraid of one thing. If this motion is withdrawn it will require unanimous consent to have it reinstated, and that consent may not be forthcoming. I do not believe the government can assure us of that because there are other sections of the house which may not be agreeable. Apart from that, I have no wish to hold up the proceedings in any way. If it can be reinstated and we have positive assurance from all sides of the house to that effect, I would not want to delay the discussion any further.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Could not the house go into supply by unanimous consent, and could not the motion and the amendment thereto stand on the order paper by unanimous consent? In that way all positions will be preserved.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Ilsley moves, seconded by Mr. Lapointe (Quebec East), that I do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of supply, on the understanding that by unanimous consent of the house the amendment moved by the hon. member for Haldimand will be restored to the order paper.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not what we understood.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it I am instructed by the house to give the direction to place it upon the order paper immediately after this debate is concluded.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not what we understood. Is it not possible by unanimous consent to allow this motion and amendment to stand, and then by unanimous consent have the house go into committee of supply? The amendment should be left upon the order paper; I do not care how it is done as long as we accomplish the end we have in mind. I am afraid that if your suggestion is carried out, Mr. Speaker, some hon. member may get up and object to this being done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker has said that he has now been instructed by the house to restore the motion.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): As long as we accomplish the end we have in view.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Fournier (Hull) in the chair.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

422. Special. To provide for payments on reduction in wheat acreages, under conditions prescribed by the governor in council, for administration expenses in connection therewith, and for temporary appointments that may be required notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act, \$35,000,000.

Mr. BENCE: Mr. Chairman, I had intended to speak in connection with wheat on the amendment of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn), in which case I would have prefaced my remarks by stating that the wheat policy of this government is being condemned by all the people in the prairie provinces as being totally inadequate to meet the problems of the prairie farmers. The wheat policy of the government, which was announced by the two heads of wheat, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon), a few weeks ago, and which was elaborated upon a few days ago by the Minister of Agriculture is a most disappointing and disheartening blow to the prairie farmer in particular and to the western provinces in general. In all our conjectures and speculations as to what the policy would be, none of us thought that the farmer would get quite as poor as he is getting under this policy. I want to protest as emphatically as I can against the inadequacy of the proposals which do not provide our farmers with even a decent standard of living.

Before I go into the few remarks which I want to present to the committee this afternoon, I should like to make a suggestion with respect to the two heads of wheat, which has been made before in this house and also in the press. Last fall the Minister of Agriculture stated that the wheat policy of the government was in the hands of two ministers, the Minister of Trade and Commerce and himself; the government going on the basis that two heads were better than one. I believe, and many others from the prairie provinces believe, that we would get better and more concerted action, and that we would remove a lot of confusion which exists in the minds of so many people, if the wheat policy of this country was under the jurisdiction of one minister of the crown.

I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture should assume the whole burden in connection with production, sales, financing, the construction of storage facilities on the farm and so on. He has stated that this is a tremendous problem, but if he feels it is too great a