

The Address—Mr. Ross (Souris)

cash grain quotations, Winnipeg and Chicago, were as follows:

	Winnipeg	Chicago	Difference
Wheat .....	.90	1.45½	.55½
Oats .....	.51½	.62	.10½
Barley .....	.64½	.90	.25½
Rye .....	.65½	.84½	.19½

Then the implements of production cost much more in Canada than in the United States. On previous occasions I have placed upon *Hansard* price charts showing these differences. A comparison of the prices of four of the necessary farm implements in Canada as between 1934 and 1941 is as follows:

	1934	1941
2-furrow gang plough.. . . .	\$137.50	\$155.00
8-foot cultivator.. . . .	143.00	162.00
20-row double disc drill.. . . .	250.50	295.25
8-foot binder.. . . .	257.00	327.00

The average increase in the cost of these four farm implements, which are most necessary on any farm, was 18½ per cent during that period. To-day there is a large demand for power equipment, but it is expensive and difficult to obtain. According to agricultural statistics the average wages of farm help by the month increased by over 65 per cent from 1940 to 1942. It is most difficult to obtain help at any price, since agriculturists find it impossible to compete with industry in order to obtain labour on their farms. In the matter of live stock, Winnipeg and Chicago quotations as of January 30, 1943, were as follows:

	Winnipeg	Chicago	Difference
Fat steers.....	\$11 00	\$15 50	\$4 50
Fat cows.....	9 50	12 50	3 00
Fat calves.....	12 00	16 50	4 50
Fat hogs.....	15 35	15 35	....

The choice hog in the United States weighs from 190 pounds to 330 pounds. The choice hog in the Canadian market weighs from 190 pounds to 230 pounds. The Canadian producer takes a heavy cut in price for the hog weighing over 230 pounds; for any producer knows that it costs much less per pound to put weight on a hog over 200 pounds than under that weight. There is a large disparity in connection with grain, live stock and dairy product prices to-day; and will any hon. member say that the agriculture industry should not be entitled to parity at this time?

In connection with the man-power muddle, there is no master plan. Agriculture, labour and the armed forces are all competing for our man-power resources; there is no co-ordination whatever. Last July a young man in my constituency, the only male on a half section, with a widowed mother, in order not to be drafted volunteered for the air force, and was accepted. He asked for leave to assist in harvesting his mother's crop, but his

request was refused. I investigated his case in detail and wired the officer in command of the manning pool in an attempt to get harvest leave for the boy, but my request also was refused. I could cite many such examples. I could go back to the fall of 1941, when a strenuous effort was made to get men into the armed forces and the categories were lowered. I know of one farmer who in many respects was a splendid chap, though suffering a certain physical handicap. He was just over thirty years of age, tactful in the handling of other men, and a fine mechanic who could repair machinery out in the open field. He operated several sections of land and had a large number of live stock. He did not particularly want to serve in the armed forces, but he offered his services so that when his pals came back he might at least say that he had tried to enlist. His neighbours knew of his physical handicap and much to their surprise he was accepted during the fall of 1941. I have already placed upon *Hansard* figures showing what it costs to equip and train a man in the armed forces. This man was trained and sent overseas; after fifteen months he was brought back to Canada and discharged. I know of other young farmers in my neighbourhood who enlisted, came home and sold their farms and equipment, and after a few months were found to be physically unfit and were discharged. Some time ago it was officially stated that there had been more than 60,000 discharges from the armed forces. Imagine the amount of money that has been wasted in equipping and training some 60,000 men, many of whom never should have been accepted, to say nothing of the man-power lost and the lessening of production that has resulted.

The man-power situation has been lamentable in this country. During August of 1940 we had a national registration of men and women, conducted under the supervision of the Department of National War Services, then headed by the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). Advantage was never taken of this registration, as I had imagined it would be, in order to develop a master plan for agriculture, industry and the armed forces. In this connection those who are interested might read the opinions with respect to farm labour as expressed on June 2, 1942, by the Minister of Agriculture, at page 3267 of *Hansard*, or those of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) at page 3471 of *Hansard* for June 9, 1942. The indifference of these ministers at that time to the question of agricultural help is astonishing to many of us now.