

Supply—Agriculture

and what the consumer pays. I am speaking more particularly of the hog producer. As I have indicated, neither in the case of hogs nor in the case of eggs is there a floor in this country which will guarantee the producer a fair and just price or even a stated price for which the government has taken credit for a number of years.

Surely in this year of 1956 this parliament, faced with a gross national income of over \$26 billion, should not have to look into the dim past for an agricultural policy. We should be able to bring forth a policy which will meet the needs of a progressive country, a country which can produce not only for its own people but for hungry people abroad. Under that kind of policy the producer would be protected and have a guarantee of justice and a fair income.

Mr. Cardiff: Mr. Chairman, I rise to take part in this debate because the minister has given us a program to follow of which I for one do not entirely approve. The Minister of Agriculture has proved himself to be a much better political adviser to the government than a minister of agriculture so far as the farmers are concerned. I have listened to him for the last 16 years, and I give him credit for being a clever minister. I appreciate his ability in a great many respects, and certainly would not attempt to analyse the figures he has given us at one time or another. The fact is that he is a marvel with figures and pretty hard to tie down when he is quoting them.

An hon. Member: He is telling the truth.

Mr. Cardiff: I was not intimating that he does not tell the truth at all times. I have great respect for the minister in that regard, but he has the happy faculty of twisting figures.

An hon. Member: Figures do not lie.

Mr. Gardiner: I just give them, I do not twist them.

Mr. Cardiff: The minister has placed on Hansard certain figures. We have not had an opportunity of seeing for ourselves what they mean, but when it comes to telling the farmers that they are in a better position than they ever were, that is a different story.

Anyone who knows anything at all about farm income knows perfectly well that the farmers of this country are the only group which has not prospered as the national income has gone up. All other groups have prospered under that increase, but the farmers have not. They are the ones who have been taking the brunt of this thing from start to finish. They always get the last rise in prices and when prices start to go down they

take the first fall. We have been taking falls for almost three years. We have been going down instead of going up at a time when everything we have to buy has gone up. The price we get for what we produce does not constitute something that is real. What we have left after we have bought what we have to buy is our profit, and we have not had very much profit.

I do not intend to talk about wheat, but if I were going to I would say that the government is to blame to a large extent for the fact that we are out of the British market with our wheat. We refused to let the British dealers sign for \$2 wheat because we insisted on \$2.05. As a result we have never sold any wheat at that price. We could just as well have held the British market as lost it. The British are smart buyers, and they know when they are offered a good price.

When we held our wheat at \$2.05 we lost the British market, and since then they have not been buying very much wheat from us. I heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce state that we had not lost the British market, that they would have to buy wheat from us, but they have not had to buy wheat from us. They bought their wheat from Russia, where they could buy more cheaply than here. Not only that, but countries in Europe have been forced to grow their own wheat because ours was too expensive to buy.

Had we in the east been able to buy feed wheat at a price we could afford to pay we would have bought many thousands of bushels. That would have made more space available in the elevators for wheat now lying out on the prairies. That is one reason we have such a surplus of wheat, because we in the east could not afford to buy feed grain.

When we found we could not buy feed grain at a price we could afford to pay we had to buy screenings, which up to that point had not cost anybody anything but had been taken off the western farmers as dockage. We had to buy those dirty screenings that should have been burned, at a time when there was plenty of surplus grain in the west. We could easily have bought a lot of that grain and thus made storage space available for thousands of bushels of wheat now lying out on the prairies.

Progress reported.

IMMIGRATION ACT**AMENDMENT RESPECTING ACQUISITION AND LOSS OF CITIZENSHIP**

Mr. H. A. MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent) moved the second reading of Bill No. 7, to amend the Immigration Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to propose this amendment to the Immigration Act I am

[Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain).]