

a long, long while, and I know that if I had done what my hon. friends opposite are doing I would never have heard the end of the ridicule that would have been poured on me not only in this house but in the provincial house. But my hon. friends opposite are inviting that very thing. Now we are dealing with a resolution preparatory to a new bill which may be called, and I say so without any irreverence at all, the second resurrection of this bill, the second coming of the unemployment and farm relief measure. Why leave us open to that kind of ridicule? My hon. friends act very strangely. If there is a wrong way under heaven of doing a thing they will cross the street in order to go about it the wrong way. They are quite irregular in their ways. But what is the use of complaining? There seems to be no capacity for improvement in them. I hope, however, that it may never occur again, and may I hope that if we require this legislation to be reenacted the third time, they will take time sufficiently by the forelock to introduce their new measure before the old one expires? I hope that we shall not require it again because some parts of the country that were up against it during the last two or three years have good prospects of a crop this year, and that may possibly help all along the line.

There are two or three questions which I wish to bring to the minister's attention, of which I would like him to make a mental note or a little memo if he likes. Some time in March the question was brought up as to the suggested bonus of one dollar per acre on the seeded acreage in Saskatchewan and other parts of the west where there was no crop. It will be recalled that where there was a good crop a bonus was given by the government on the basis of five cents a bushel, and that was generosity itself compared with the way that those settlers fared who had no crop at all. I am not complaining at all of the bonus that was given to those who had a crop or that it was a bit too much; not at all. The total amount granted by way of the five cents a bushel bonus was around eight or ten million dollars. But why such a violent contrast between the treatment of those who had a crop and those who had no crop, in favour of the former? The Minister of Agriculture in a very nice and fairly well reasoned out speech some time in March pointed out that the government had been quite generous with the west in the matter of the five cents a bushel bonus, what is called the compensating adjustment bonus, and he argued that inasmuch as the government had been generous, the house and the country generally might very well trust

[Mr. Motherwell.]

the government to do the right thing with regard to the proposed dollar an acre on the seeded acreage in the south where there was no crop. So far as I know, that is the way it stands at the present. I was unavoidably absent yesterday, and possibly somebody else asked this question. If so, the minister does not need to answer it a second time. He can just refer me to the page of Hansard where I may find the answer. I submit, however, that the time has come when the minister, after consulting his colleagues, should give to the petitioners who presented that request a definite answer whether they may expect anything along that line or anything to correspond to it. That would only be fair.

The minister knows that this is the first time that I have spoken on this measure in committee. He knows that I have taken up a number of labour problems with him in personal interview and in writing, and I can testify that in each case he has dealt with them quite satisfactorily. Because of that I hope and expect that he will deal with these questions, if not satisfactorily, at all events to the extent of giving us the government's policy, preferably on the second reading of the bill. That is one question, the proposed bonus of one dollar an acre on the seeded acreage.

The other question is this. As the minister and the house know, Saskatchewan has been hit pretty hard in the matter of those needing relief and employment. We are sorry for ourselves and for the dominion as well because of that. Saskatchewan has always been looked upon as the outstanding wheat province of the dominion, for many, many years growing more wheat than all the rest of the dominion put together. I do not know whether that is something to be proud of or not, but it is a fact anyhow. Saskatchewan is handling her relief in cooperation with this government on a different basis from any other province. I am not criticizing that. Some have taken the ground that the whole business of relief should have been handed over to a commission. At all events, we have a commission handling relief in the province of Saskatchewan. I am not going to criticize that relief commission just now; I have in the past, but not to-day. Now I am in the humour to get information, which I hope the minister will give on the second reading of the bill after he has had an opportunity of discussing these questions with his colleagues.

I would like to know if the government hold themselves in any way responsible for the treatment that is being meted out to the Saskatchewan farmers through the medium