

the objectives sought would be attained. And what have we? We have a measure based on the if, as and when principle.

Mr. KINLEY: It is a good principle.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, it is a measure of what it may be expedient to do in a given period of time in a somewhat remote future. It is a matter, therefore, of entire speculation. I must confess that sympathetic as I am to the objective of all of us I am disappointed that no real solution of this problem has been reached. I have reflected on this matter, and I have come to the conclusion, because of the inexorable laws of economics, the principles of supply and demand—and here I find myself in agreement with the minister when he said that we should not do anything to retard production of agricultural products in the post-war period—because of the very nature of the problem from an economic point of view, while I had hoped that a specific remedy would be found, that no formula can be adopted that would be entirely satisfactory or hold out the promise of that which we all desire to attain.

Canada is an agricultural country. We have large surpluses and those surpluses must be exported. They are subject to world competition and world prices, and unless we are prepared to resort tremendously to the principle of subsidies in peace time—and I do not think the minister or anybody else likes that kind of economy—I do not think any real solution of this problem in peace time can be found.

I have always thought that in a peace-time period the best prices that could be obtained for our butter, we will say, were obtained when our domestic consumption of butter just about equalled our production. When we had a surplus there was bound to be a drop in the price of this important farm product. Therefore, so far as my intelligence carries me, I have reached the conclusion that no economic formula can be adopted which will carry with it the objective that every one of us would like to see attained. I daresay that is also the result of the minister's own investigations and the investigations of his advisers. Perforce he has been driven by the old laws of economics, which are in peace time more or less inexorable, to adopt a policy which, after all, in its final analysis means subsidization. I cannot see anything else for it. I must confess, therefore, to a certain degree of disappointment with the measure that has been brought down which is now before us and which we have been debating to-day; yet, to be absolutely fair about the matter, I

do not know what else the minister could have done. I am going to pay him that compliment. He may think it is a left-handed compliment, but it is not intended to be. It is intended to show that if this is his considered judgment, that it is the only thing that can be done and that no other legislation is possible, then I think the country ought to accept it. I thought it was in that spirit that we were debating the matter to-day. I am a bit disillusioned by the minister's speech, because I thought he went out of his way to make a political dissertation over a matter that should be far beyond the realm of party politics. I suppose he will not pay much attention to that; he has said that he has not paid much attention to things that I have said in the past with which he has not agreed. Be that as it may—

Mr. GARDINER: I just said that. I did not say they were untrue.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I understood the minister did not want to be interrupted; that was his way of settling me for the time being, and I am not disposed to quarrel with the position he has taken.

May I now, having dwelt on the principle of the measure, refer just for a moment to the political aspect of the minister's speech. I know that this is outside the rules, but I ask the Chairman to forgive me. The minister is quite in error when he says that the only social legislation ever introduced into this house was introduced by the Liberal party.

Mr. KINLEY: Passed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No; he said "introduced into this house." That, of course, is not a correct reading of history. He was not here between 1930 and 1935—

Mr. GARDINER: I qualified it with the word "important".

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not important either. I recall to his mind that a very earnest and sincere attempt was made on the part of the government of that day to introduce social legislation, and I will say this further that we thought it was based on sound, legal, constitutional considerations. The courts declared otherwise, and we have to abide by the result. But the minister must not think, and I do not want anyone in this house to think, nor do I believe the country thinks, that the membership of the Liberal party has a monopoly of all the virtues, that it has a monopoly of all fine feeling for the well-being of the people of the country, for that is not true. He talked about Liberalism as they had it in England, and about reforms instituted in England. I wonder if his reading