

called to the armed forces. Reliable authorities estimate that Canadian farms need at least 100,000 workers.

Mr. MITCHELL: Would my hon. friend give me the source of that figure?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: The 60,000 figure was given by—

Mr. MITCHELL: I am talking about the other. Does my hon. friend know that we put 53,000 additional workers on the farms of Ontario last summer? I should like the source of the statement with regard to the 100,000 additional workers.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I have heard that from leaders of farm organizations.

Mr. MITCHELL: Who are they?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: They stated that in their judgment there are needed on the farms of Canada at least 100,000 workers. The minister may have more definite information and may be able to assure us that that is not the situation.

Mr. MITCHELL: Could my hon. friend give me the name of any leader who said that?

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I prefer not. Unless selective service can deliver at least 50,000 or 60,000 men to the farms of this country, other steps will have to be taken to provide this number of farm help. I suggest, as has been suggested by other members of this house, that if selective service is not able to deliver the required number of workers to the farms of Ontario, arrangements should be made to grant long leaves to experienced farmers who now make up a part of this army of 60,000 or 70,000 men which constitutes our home defence army. Some such plan is needed. Some definite steps are required in order to enable the farmers of this country to deliver the production they are being asked to deliver. If our agricultural workers are to make their contribution, not only must the problem of help be solved, but some way must be found to enable the farmer to pay his help wages which are to some extent commensurate with those which could be earned in other fields of industry. That, I suggest, will have to be done either by enabling the farmer to secure prices for his products which will enable him to compete with industry in securing help, or the government will have to do in the case of the farmer as it does for Imperial Oil and other oil companies in this country, namely, subsidize farm help just as it has subsidized gasoline and other industrial products.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have a few questions to ask the minister with respect to national selective service, but first I would say to my

[Mr. Noseworthy.]

hon. friend who has just sat down that if it were not for the profound pity I have for him because of the line of argument he followed in his remarks, I would be disposed to take a few minutes to set him right. I think we owe it to this committee that we should at least be fair with respect to what has happened in the past. I was sorry, because I have had a high regard for the hon. member and still have although he has made a mistake, to raise the question as he did to-night, in order to reflect upon a very great Canadian who has been rendering service as he sees best in our national life. When my hon. friend talks of twistings and turnings of policies I think the committee will agree that his group must be regarded as speaking with the voice of experience in such matters, for I think no one could follow the devious course which has been followed by that group since the war began and before. But I do not wish to weary the committee at this stage of the debate by detailing the various shifts and changes that have been made by these hon. gentlemen. It would take too long, and I doubt whether it would be profitable to the committee or to the country as a whole, so that I will leave it at that.

It seems to me from the notes I took this afternoon of the speech made by the Minister of Agriculture that either he or the Minister of Labour must have his facts confused. I have not had an opportunity of perusing *Hansard*, but I think my notes are reasonably correct. I understood the Minister of Agriculture to say that when the second call was made last year, all those who had not registered in 1940, about 144,000, turned up and registered. I think the Minister of Agriculture must have had the issues somewhat confused in his own mind. I think it is only proper that I should attempt to put the record straight, and it is particularly for that reason that I rise now. Surely the Minister of Agriculture was incorrect when he spoke of 144,000 having turned up of those who had not registered in 1940, because in the Minister of Labour's own statement as reported at page 3946 of *Hansard*, these 144,973 men are described as follows:

This past winter we required all single men to report who had failed to receive or acknowledge their notices of medical examination, or to present themselves for medical examination. We announced an amnesty to those who complied as required by March 15. This resulted in 144,973 men re-registering.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is correct.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am glad to have the minister's confirmation on that.