

*Agricultural Products Act*

question these. On the other table presented by others the figures are for 1938 and then 1947 and 1948. These are in pounds, not dollars. I am quite sure these figures would not be the department's figures because they are in pounds. They must be English figures. I doubt very much whether my figures show anything different from what is here for these particular years, but I gave ten years in order to show the development.

**Mr. Fulton:** I am glad to find that the minister does not question the figures produced by the bureau of statistics, because I rely on them. It was because I placed reliance on these figures that I made the statements which I did, that the record shows the Canadian agricultural production for the past three years, if the minister wants to confine it to that—

**Mr. Gardiner:** No, I took ten years. I am not talking about the last three.

**Mr. Fulton:** —has been declining.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order. I will read clause 1 to the committee:

1. Section eleven of the Agricultural Products Act, chapter ten of the statutes of 1947, as enacted by section one of chapter one of the statutes of 1947-48, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"1. This act shall expire on the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and fifty."

All that is before the committee is simply a clause extending the time.

**Mr. Fulton:** Are we to take it that the import of what you have just said is that we cannot discuss in detail the effect of the act which we are now asked to extend by this clause? I would suggest that one of the reasons which might influence us, in agreeing to this clause, or otherwise, is the record of agricultural production under the act which we are now discussing.

**The Deputy Chairman:** I point out to hon. members that all that is before the committee is a clause extending the time. The rule is clear; it is that speeches in committee must be strictly relevant to the clause under discussion.

**Mr. Fulton:** That is so, Mr. Chairman, but in order to be relevant to the clause before the committee one has to discuss the act which we are asked to extend. When you have a bill which consists of one clause only, the principle of the bill can only be contained in that clause, and therefore one cannot discuss that clause without discussing the whole act.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order. The hon. member is now discussing the principle of the bill.

**Mr. Fulton:** No; I was making a point.

**The Deputy Chairman:** The principle of the bill was decided on second reading. The hon. gentleman is a good lawyer and I shall leave it to him to use his own judgment as to whether his speech is relevant to the clause.

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the position in which you have placed me and the confidence which you repose in me. Therefore I shall not abuse that confidence. I shall not go into it as I had intended; I shall content myself by saying that my acquiescence in the carriage of the principle of the bill would not have been given at all had it not been that the figures I was given are different from the figures which the minister has received, and I had hoped to be able to discuss them in committee and point out that they put quite a different light on this whole matter from the figures which the minister has given with regard to the production of apples. I will not say any more about it except that the figures I have seen show that the British domestic production is not the reason why we have lost the apple market over there. The figures show that the British domestic production has not increased in 1946 and 1947 over the pre-war years. The reasons are partly exchange difficulties, and partly other factors.

**Mr. Gardiner:** I do not think there is any difference in the figures that I have given, in so far as what has been said is concerned, and the figures given by the hon. member. For the last three years the imports of apples into the United Kingdom were:

	hundredweight
1946 .....	1,800,000
1947 .....	1,490,000
1948 .....	1,956,000

I do not question the fact that imports were higher in that last year than they were in the other two preceding years. I gave those figures and they show that the imports were higher. But what I did say was that they were not as high as they were back in 1938, when they were some 7 million and some odd. I accounted for that by showing that there were no imports, just for the very reason my hon. friend gives. There were no imports from Canada and none from the United States. Those totaled back at that time 4,564,000 hundredweight from those two countries alone.

I went so far as to say that if you added the United States and Canadian figures of 1938 to the 1948 figures, your figures would not be very far short of what these were. In other words, the reason was a lack of dollars. That is the argument I used. I take it the argument my friend is putting up is that dollars were responsible for that position.