

*Supply—Agriculture*

the inclusion of many very small farms in accordance with the census definition.

The average income per farm in the prairie provinces adjusted to constant dollars—1948-57=100—varied between \$1,714 and \$6,631 during the period 1935-57. The average for the period was \$4,255 and in 1957 was only fractionally lower at \$4,242. The pattern of the changes was one of rapid if sporadic, increase from 1935-52, followed by a fairly steady decline. However, even expressed in constant dollars, income per farm in 1957 was still one third above the 1935-44 ten year average.

Income per improved acre adjusted to a constant dollar value—1948-57=100—also varied widely during the period under review, from a low of \$8.47 to a high of \$22.96 per acre. In 1957 adjusted income per acre was \$13 as compared with an average of \$15.85 for the ten year period.

The average annual income per acre from wheat, adjusted to a constant dollar value—1948-57=100—for the prairie provinces fluctuated between \$10.91 and \$33.02. The average for the ten years was \$20.95 and for 1957 was \$18.85.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I am rising on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I refrained from making any comment on this vote but I, like my hon. friend from Burin-Burgeo, would have liked to point out that not only in agriculture but in the oldest industry of Canada, the fisheries, fluctuations in price of this character take place. What the minister is doing now is making a long academic discourse, and it seems to me to be quite out of order and unrelated to this item.

**Mr. Churchill:** On the contrary, I am putting on the record facts, something which the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate has always strenuously avoided. He deals so much with theory and gets so aroused emotionally over various problems that it is difficult for him to deal with the facts of a situation, and that is exactly what I am dealing with on this occasion.

**Mr. Pearson:** A point of order has been raised, and perhaps the minister could sit down long enough for it to be determined.

**The Deputy Chairman:** There is no question but that the Chair has allowed quite a lot of latitude this afternoon, but I think, that hon. members should come back to this item No. 663, because if the chair allows latitude to one it has to allow it to another.

**Mr. Churchill:** There was considerable discussion with regard to the cost price-squeeze

and all those other matters affecting the income of prairie farmers, and these points I have mentioned are related to that.

**The Deputy Chairman:** There was no objection raised when that happened, but now an objection has been voiced the Chair must bring members back closer to this particular item.

**Mr. Churchill:** Mr. Chairman, it is extraordinarily difficult when the Chair is obliged to restrict a speaker after allowing so much latitude but I shall certainly respect the ruling. May I make a few comments with regard to marketings and exportings of wheat which are related to this problem. The hon. member for Assiniboia mentioned that and said that over the years marketings had remained very constant but may I point out that these marketings would not have remained at the high level at which they have been the last few years had it not been for a vigorously pursued export policy. That was dealt with by the Prime Minister who indicated that we had set a record this year of 317 million bushels of wheat for export of which 23 million bushels constituted an increase in our cash sales and 32 million bushels represented loans and gifts to the Colombo plan countries.

The suggestions for deficiency payments have run into enormous sums of money but it is sometimes overlooked that we are now expending a considerable amount of financial support. Let me just illustrate that. In this vote there is provision for \$40 million. There were excess storage charges on wheat running between \$35 million and \$40 million. During the course of the last crop year approximately \$50 million was expended by way of outright gifts or long term loans for the export of wheat. The payments for this year under P.F.A.A. may run between \$25 million and \$30 million. During the course of one year we have expended approximately \$150 million to \$160 million in support of western agriculture over and above the advantages that accrue from low freight rates on grain moving to our ports.

The long range program is part and parcel of this vote which we are considering today. In conclusion I would suggest that in that the essential and most important factor is to press on with an export program with respect to wheat that will reduce the surplus that has been hanging over our heads in this country for some time. That surplus was reduced during the course of this crop year by over 100 million bushels of wheat and in the coming crop year it may be reduced by an equal amount or more. However, we will still be left with a considerable surplus of wheat in Canada. Unless that surplus of