

And further:

The shortage of labour, of machinery and methods of price control are limiting the vitally essential expansion of this production and the flocks and herds upon which production depends. And unless we can quickly realize and quickly reverse these limiting forces there are dangers to the conduct of the war.

And again:

But there is an even deeper cause of these shortages. We had all these burdens and difficulties in the last war. We are to-day exporting less than half the meats and fats to our allies that we did in the last war, for we then had to support France, Belgium and Italy also. Yet with this lesser burden of exports we are threatened with greater shortages of meats and fats on our home front than in world war I.

And again:

After all, the best remedy for price is increased production.

May I pause there to point out that apparently the hon. member for Danforth quite overlooked this factor in the matter of inflation. Inflation is, after all, a rise in price, and that arises from a shortage of goods. If we can stimulate our production sufficiently we need not fear a rise in price. Again I quote:

But the first and imperative necessity is to get more production. The American farmer will do it if he gets a chance. And the fate of the world may depend upon it.

I believe that with very slight modification every one of those quotations could be applied to the situation which exists in Canada. I maintain that the minister and the other members of the government should have been much more careful to leave in the essential industries a good many more effectives than they did. I believe that there was carelessness on the part of the ministers of defence in taking away too many key men, but I am not going to press that because it is water under the bridge.

Every precaution should have been taken to give prices, bonuses and other forms of encouragement such as credit to the farmers, access to live stock, access to materials, so as to enable them to produce at maximum capacity. In my own constituency this year I was called into a conference by machinery agents and was really astounded to learn to what an alarming degree the farmers in my constituency were to be deprived of essential machinery for the conduct of this year's operations. We simply have not given the attention we should have to providing the farmers with the necessary means of production, and in many respects that is the result of our financial policy. We should have brought into production every potential producer of

dairy products, honey, eggs, wool, poultry, beef, pork, fruits, wood, fish, lumber, et cetera, from coast to coast in Canada. There should have been not only a ceiling which was high enough but a floor which was also high enough to guarantee to the producer not only the cost of production but such a reward as would enable him to live and encourage him to continue producing, and guaranteed prices should have been established to continue for two or three years after the war.

I was talking with a farmer in my constituency just before I left for Ottawa. He was contemplating the purchase of a valuable Ayrshire cow costing a considerable amount of money, but he said, "I am afraid I had better not buy that cow because just about the time I get through paying this fancy price for her and getting an expensive shed built for her and other equipment purchased, the war will be over and I shall have the cow on my hands and be out my money." That is a characteristic and very common reaction among the farmers. It leads to uncertainty and hesitancy and militates against the war effort because, beyond question, it militates against production. There are thousands of farmers, villagers and townspeople who would produce honey if they could get bees, who would raise chickens to produce eggs, who would raise cows or sheep and provide the facilities for taking care of them if they were certain that a remunerative price would be guaranteed for long enough after the war to enable them, as they say, to get out from under. That guarantee is freely given to those who go into the production of munitions. If the farmers were sure that they would be able to market at remunerative prices all the eggs they produced, there is no question that production would increase, and the same with other farm products. One would think that anyone with sufficient intelligence to be selected for any post of responsibility in the conduct of this country's affairs would be able to see that. Are we to imagine that the minister was unable to see it? Are we to imagine that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) were unable to see it? Then why did they not take care of the matter? Purely on account of financial considerations. In other words, they were bound by financial restrictions, not by the question whether bees, or cows, or sheep, or lumber, or all the other necessities for production, could be bought. They were not bound by the question whether or not there were plenty of men to help them produce, but by financial considerations, and