

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Why is he not here? Why the remote control?

Mr. GRAYDON: I think I might say that the problem in the future will not be that of having a seat for John Bracken, but that of having a seat for the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Oh, yes? The Prime Minister is here.

Mr. GRAYDON: And let me go further than that. We also hear, through the press, that not only is the Prime Minister in danger, but, as pointed out by the premier of Saskatchewan, the Minister of Agriculture, who has so often been lauded by the hon. member for Halton, will not be here again to represent his present seat at Melville.

Mr. GARDINER: And does my hon. friend accept the evidence of the leader of the government of Saskatchewan?

Mr. GRAYDON: Well, he seemed to be able to take the measure of the present minister a short time ago.

Mr. TUCKER: And what about the Progressive Conservative party?

Mr. GRAYDON: May I say this, in the midst of these stormy interruptions—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Why bring this hash into the debate?

Mr. GRAYDON: Mr. Speaker, is it possible to have order? I have submitted to a good deal of interruption, and while I rather enjoy it, I should like to continue.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is hash.

Mr. GRAYDON: So far as agriculture is concerned, from time to time in this chamber we have heard far too much about rehabilitation and reconstruction of other parts of Canada; we have heard far too much about national endeavour and national enterprise, in comparison with the little about the farming industry in the post-war period. The job of rehabilitation and reconstruction in Canada is not confined to industry alone. It is not confined only to business. I believe I will have support when I say that without prosperity of agriculture in Canada in the post-war period, there cannot be a prosperous Canada. That I believe is one of the prime factors and one of the prime influences which will make for a greater Canada in the new era of a better world.

An attempt has been made by this bill to meet a problem which has been demanding redress for a long time. I am not going to endorse all the details of the bill before the

house. I desire only to say that it is a step in the right direction. But there are certain omissions from the bill. One of these was touched upon by one or two speakers who preceded me; I refer to the period which the legislation covers. The problem of agriculture is not a matter only for the transition period. The problem of agriculture is one which will have to be solved by a permanent and long-range plan. If I were to offer any special criticism of this bill it would be that it deals only in a temporary way with what I think is a permanent and long-range problem.

There is a justifiable feeling in the rural parts of Canada that the agricultural income through the years has not been on a fair level, having in mind the returns obtained by other branches of industry. Look over the personnel of this house, if you will. You will see men who came here directly from many professions but who were born and raised and brought up in rural parts. Look at the various professions in Canada, the various industries. You will then see the tremendous contribution which has been made by the men and women who have come off the farms of this land. You will not find the same influx into agriculture from other activities and professions in Canada. Why? It is true that from time to time there are men who have made their money in other businesses and who go into farming in order to lose some of it, but that is not a normal influx into agriculture. I refer to this merely to show that the test as to whether or not agriculture is getting a square deal in Canada is the extent to which people are anxious to leave it, or on the other hand are anxious to go into it. I think that is the best test that should be applied.

Perhaps it is fortunate that agriculture has produced men and women who have entered other forms of industry. Most of these left the farms because they did not like the life, because of the inconveniences, because there was not enough cash return in it. Those of us who came off the farm know what our parents in those early days wanted for their boys and girls. You know it; so do I. Time after time they stated the reasons why they wanted an education for their children. They did not want their boys and girls to go through the drudgery and hard work, to suffer all the inconveniences and uncertainties that they had had to suffer. We may as well face that. Agriculture was left in that position while industry, the professions and so on were returning higher rewards. Some of these men and women I think could have achieved the same success in agriculture as they did in the professions or in industry. The important thing is to have a proper and decent balance in respect to the income received by agricul-