

Agricultural Prices Support Act

It would appear from an article printed in the *Manitoba Co-operator* of December 8 that many people are dissatisfied with the stand taken in connection with the international commodity clearing house. I have here a number of complaints which I should like to put on record to show that people in many parts of Canada, and engaged in different occupations, are beginning to realize the importance of our industry.

The article reads:

A strangulation of the international commodity clearing house, as proposed by Director-General N. E. Dodd, at the fifth annual conference of the food and agriculture organization in Washington, has brought a flood of strong and vigorous protests. The U.S. State Department and other government representatives from other countries, succeeded in defeating the ICCH plan.

I might point out that Canada is one of the countries which voted against the proposal. Perhaps there were some reasons, but I think those reasons might very well have been overcome. The article continues:

The protests came from organized agriculture, through the international federation of agriculture producers, labour and religious organizations.

The conference backed a substitute proposal providing for a consolidated international committee with no authority and no funds.

The hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch), speaking in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, dealt with this matter in full detail, pointing out that representatives of the international monetary fund were present when those discussions took place, and that they will be present again when there are other discussions. He pointed out that, as in the past, money will again be made the master rather than the servant of the people.

While this condition is allowed to continue I feel that agriculture and the people of Canada generally will not be permitted to have that degree of justice to which they are entitled. The article continues:

H. H. Hannam, president of the IFAP, and president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, spoke on behalf of the farm organizations associated with IFAP.

Murray D. Lincoln, president of the Co-operative League of the U.S.A., took an aggressive part to overcome opposition to ICCH.

Wm. Green, American Federation of Labour president, cabled from London—"Economic interests of the people of all nations will be best promoted through the adoption of such a policy," as outlined by FAO Director-General N. E. Dodd.

Phillip Murray, CIO president, said "CIO feels that an extension of principles of aiding the countries of the world to balance their foreign trade would be furthered by the adoption of the principles and concepts of ICCH."

"American farm families are confronted with sharply curtailed incomes as a reward for their productivity, while underfed families elsewhere find it impossible to secure the food they desire . . . It is neither humane nor economically sound to wait for a gradual adjustment in international

trade," stated Right Rev. Luigi G. Ligutti, executive secretary of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, and Rev. W. J. Gibbons, S.J., of the conference's executive committee.

Emil Rieve, president of the textile workers union of America, urged Secretary of Agriculture Brannan to modify the U.S. delegation's position "to prevent an imminent and serious dislocation of American and world agriculture with attendant insane and inhuman destruction of so-called surpluses and restriction of production."

I have pointed out that in the past agriculture has done its full share and that if it is only given some encouragement, it will continue to do so in the future. In this morning's *Citizen* we find an account of the recognition being given Canada, the United States and other nations for the help given to Britain. Britain at the present time is setting up a memorial valued at £2 million so that students from this and other countries may make their homes over there when they are receiving tuition in London. This, I believe, is worth-while recognition, which will be appreciated in many parts of Canada. In some of our daily and weekly papers we have seen articles dealing with agriculture, and suggesting that the prices of agricultural products should be reduced so that the consumers may have a lower cost of living. They do not realize that by doing this they are putting some of the workers out of employment and at the same time lowering the standard of living of farmers all across Canada. Neither do they realize that at the present time the labourer's dollar is buying more food than it ever bought before. As I have said on more than one occasion:

A little learning is a dangerous thing;

Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring.

That is why I suggest that they learn something about the other side of the picture. For their information I should like to place on record figures, showing percentages of national income received by farmers over a number of years. This information is taken from *The Budget*, a publication of the Alberta wheat pool which, in turn, gets its information from a recent issue of *The Canadian Banker*. The following table gives the percentages of net farm income of farm operators, as a percentage of net national income:

	per cent
1926	17.0
1927	14.9
1928	14.6
1929	9.5
1930	8.6
1931	4.5
1932	4.2
1933	4.1
1934	6.7
1935	7.6
1936	7.9
1937	8.1
1938	9.3
1939	10.8

[Mr. Fair.]