

present organized society from coast to coast. As a supporter of the party that sits to your left, Mr. Chairman, while I have been interested chiefly in agriculture, I have also been strongly in favour of a reasonable protective policy in order that industry may develop and thus increase our home markets. There are those who still cling to old free trade ideas, but this is not evidenced so much by the party that sits to your right. It may be said that by our support of a protective policy we have given bonuses and subsidies to industry. I have heard this argument advanced in the house on many occasions.

At times there has been great difficulty in connection with our iron and steel industry, and bonuses have been paid. A much greater percentage of bonus is paid to the iron and steel industry. We have given bonuses or subsidies, whatever you may wish to call them, to the coal industry.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Subventions.

Mr. ROWE: The leader of the opposition says that "subvention" is a more modest term. This principle has been long since established. The labouring man who carries a dinner-pail to his work is given something in the way of security. While we may not call this a subsidy or a subvention, he is given the assurance that he will have to work only so many hours for which he will receive so much money. We recognize the principle of collective bargaining so that his labour may not be exploited for the advantage of those who hold stock.

Mr. GOLDING: What assurance has he of a job?

Mr. ROWE: His union will be ready to tell you whether or not you can fire him. I am merely referring to the principle, and I doubt if even my hon. friend will disagree when I say that is the situation at the present time. I have referred to the protective policies in connection with industry. Such a policy was encouraged by the party that sits to your left, Mr. Chairman, and it has been followed by the party that sits to your right. Labour is given this security; but when this principle is applied to agriculture, there are many people in the country who hold up their hands in holy horror and say that it is unsound and vicious and should not be applied.

Why? Evidently the farmer is not organized sufficiently to carry out collective bargaining. The payment of bonuses and subsidies to agriculture under depressed conditions is just as justifiable as the payment of any other bonus or subsidy. It may be that we have too many of these artificial supports for industry; it may be that wages paid to labour

[Mr. Rowe.]

are too high, but the fact is that this is the present trend of society. It is the result of the effort on the part of all governments to equalize the conditions of all classes of our people. I do not wish to repeat what I said the other night, but I have been in favour of the payment of bonuses and subsidies when agriculture is depressed. Hon. members on the other side will recall that I was among the first, if not the first, to propose the payment of bonuses to agriculture some years ago. I urged that on different occasions on the government of the day, of which I was a supporter.

At that time I proposed bonuses for cheese, for bacon, for beef and for poultry products. This was at a time when the price of sterling meant that we were receiving low prices for our bacon, cheese and other products. Our farmers could not meet their obligations, and I made the suggestion I did at that time. It would have been a sound policy to follow, much sounder than the fantastic type of policy being presented to this committee. I suggested that, in addition to a grain commission, there be set up a live stock commission. I suggested also the establishment of an export marketing board to consider the securing of overseas markets and to supervise the inspection of grades in order to make sure that producers of live stock products were not exporting a poor class of product to the market upon which they were dependent and thus automatically forcing down the price.

I think it would be a sound policy to pay a bonus only for high grade products. This bonus could be secured from the producer, and when the price rose to a certain point it would be eliminated automatically. Such a policy would have some tinge of soundness, some tinge of permanency and some tinge of economic advantage for this country. As the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) has said, for a long time this country has been pleading for a national agricultural policy. I think we have tended too much toward being wheat-minded, and I say that with all respect for those who are struggling with the desperate problem of a surplus which is costing this country millions of dollars a year to carry.

I have had some experience in the growing of wheat, but I have not been fortunate enough to grow it in a district where I was paid for growing it or paid for not growing it. Wheat has been an important part of the crop of old Ontario, but I suppose we shall just carry on as usual. This \$35,000,000 is to be paid to people for not growing wheat, but there is no particular indication in this legislation that we shall not have a drought and that wheat will not go up again to \$1 a bushel. I suggest that what we need in this country