

Agricultural Products Act

United States at that time. There was an emergency, and that emergency was associated not only with the marketing of feed grains but also with the production of all the different kinds of food that were produced upon the farms of Canada and that were required throughout the world at that period.

Some of my hon. friends have been saying there is no emergency now. I recall to hon. members the fact that every farmer in this country made a sacrifice during that period in respect of his coarse grain and his other farm products which were fed with that coarse grain, in view of the prices which could have been obtained in the United States. Surely no one is going to contend that after the government took care that the food we could produce in this country to be utilized elsewhere in the world actually was produced, in spite of the fact that our farmers did not get a return as high as they might have obtained had there been no controls at all, no emergency exists now when under the controls we have at present our farmers are able to get more for their products than they would be able to get if allowed to enter the United States freely today. This is a continuing emergency, created by the fact that we had controls under which we asked the people to accept less for their products than they might have obtained elsewhere. The emergency still exists, requiring us to see to it that those who did sell their products at lower prices then are permitted to get a better return for their products now than they would get if we allowed this legislation to expire without the consideration it is being given at the present time. So I repeat that I think it is absolutely wrong to say, first, that there was not an emergency in 1946 in connection with the production and marketing of farm products and, second, that there was not an emergency in 1947 in connection with the finishing and marketing of farm products. It is just as much a mistake to say there is not an emergency at the present time, when it is absolutely essential that we do something to assist those who saw us through the emergency of 1946 and 1947.

Mr. MacNicol: Then the judgment of the court was wrong, was it?

Mr. Gardiner: Well, I am neither a judge nor a constitutional lawyer, but the other day the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) said the judgment was going to be appealed, so apparently some other people think the judgment was wrong. But one statement was made the other day by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) to which I should like to call attention. He rather lamented the fact that there was not a Canadian who would raise the issue in con-

nection with barley stored in the elevators at Fort William, that it had to be raised by someone living in Chicago. Well, I would recall to hon. members the fact that at that time the Americans were limiting the amount of their own barley that could be utilized for the purpose of making beer; and since we in this country were also limiting the amount of barley that could be used for that purpose I am rather proud of the fact that there was not a Canadian who would take a case of that kind to the courts and attempt to prove that it was not essential to see that the feedstuffs we had in this country were properly distributed among our farming population.

The position, then, is not that we are suggesting there is no emergency, as was said this afternoon, resulting from the situation which everyone admits existed back in 1946 and 1947. The emergency existed then; it exists still. Is anyone going to say no emergency exists in connection with food throughout the world when the British people find it necessary to accept a lower ration of bacon than they had even in the midst of the war? Is anyone going to say no emergency exists when the British have less meat per person now than they had even in the midst of the war? Is anyone going to say there is no emergency in this country when we find it necessary to say to the British, "For the time being, because you have not the money with which to pay for our products and you desire that we should sell as much as we can elsewhere, we shall deliver to you smaller amounts of the products you are desirous of obtaining". Is anyone going to say there is no emergency when from year to year we are called upon to say, "We are cutting down the amount of food we expect you to buy from us because you have not the funds we require in this country with which to pay for it. We are quite satisfied to go along and find our way into other markets, to try to sell our products elsewhere in order that you may carry on the struggle to re-establish your trade in what is known as the sterling area and build up your business again so that in the long run you will be able to do business with us on a better basis"? Of course there is an emergency; and in order to bear out my statement of a few moments ago that it is necessary to have agreements such as those on cheese, bacon and eggs, I should like to quote some prices in Canada and the United States for farm products. As of March 14 these are the official figures: Cheese, western white, Montreal, March 5, 1949, 32 cents; white cheddar Wisconsin cheese, March 5, 1949, 29 cents. In other words the farmers of Canada are getting 3 cents a pound more for

[Mr. Gardiner.]