

what was regarded as a surplus hog production. It is true that the measure brought some relief to the hog raising farmers of the United States, at the time, by stabilizing a falling market for hogs, but as a result of the policy people in other countries where food was scarce were deprived of needed bacon and pork. The same situation existed recently in the United States with respect to potatoes and eggs. It is a situation that threatens to become more general on this continent as a result of the natural desire of the farmers of Canada, and of the United States, to increase production and at the same time hold prices.

On the face of it, the policy of holding prices by limiting production, or by destroying surplus production, is morally wrong. If people in need of food are denied that food because the producers want higher prices there would seem to be both moral and economic injustice somewhere. On the other hand there would seem to be no good reason why the farmers of North America, or of any other country where surplus agricultural production may exist, should assume the responsibility of feeding the hungry people in the world wherever they may be. There must be some equitable basis on which the producers can be rewarded and the hungry can be fed, short of making the latter a charge on the former.

The crux of the problem lies with the exportable surplus. That portion of domestic production which can be consumed in the domestic market offers no problem and this is true of both agricultural and industrial production. With production geared up in both of these fields, agriculture and industry, to meet war demands, it is not surprising that we are encountering surpluses in both of them. The problem is what to do about it, and the programmes offered, of cutting back production on the one hand and subsidizing production on the other, seems both contradictory and illusionary. These solutions are bound to end disastrously as has happened before. The only situation that may change things is another world war, and this we are trying desperately to avert. It may be, however, that our very desperate efforts may have the opposite result to the one we are seeking and may in fact plunge us into another war.

Why not recognize the fact that our problem is concerned with the exportable surplus only and if we want to subsidize production subsidize that part of production, and that part only. It would of course have to be done on an equitable basis which would apply to both agricultural and industrial exportable surpluses. The needy peoples of the world should be fed, but they should also be clothed and encouraged to lead a fuller and a happier life. By subsidizing our exportable surpluses we could benefit the needy and at the same time benefit ourselves. Such subsidizing would have to be done on a scientific as well as on an equitable basis and here again a scientific international tariff to which we have previously referred might accomplish the desired result.

It is perhaps a new concept of tariffs to think of their application to agricultural production, but is there any reason why the agricultural worker should not be protected? Surely the agricultural worker is entitled to protection just as much as his fellow citizen in the industrial field. In the same way his surplus production is entitled to payment of a subsidy just as would be the surplus or exportable part of industrial production. If we recognize the fact that economic differences do exist between countries, and who can fail to recognize them, then we must logically recognize the justice of trying to equalize those differences. A general raising of standards of living everywhere can be brought about by an international scientific tariff based on national wage levels. Why not endeavour to work out such a tariff and give trade and production a chance to expand instead of seeking to contract both.