

Supply—Agriculture

1954, 40 per cent. This is the last figure we have. This will give hon. members some idea of the actual figure in percentages of the subsidies that are paid to agriculture. Do not let it be said that agriculture is the only industry that is being subsidized across the country. In only two or three years was the figure over 50 per cent, and two of those years were the years when foot-and-mouth disease had a great deal of effect upon them.

The next figure that I should like to give is the cost of the floor prices having to do strictly with butter. It has been said that a tremendous amount of money has been paid out by the taxpayers of this country to pay subsidies on butter. I shall give the cost per capita in the various years to pay the entire loss on butter by the prices support board. In 1950 it was .025 cents per capita; in 1951, .01 cents; in 1952, .003 cents; in 1953, .09 cents; and in 1954, .003 cents. If you work it out on the basis of a family of four, which is quite reasonable, you will find that the cost, in the case of a married man, in 1950, was .10 cents; in 1951, it was .4 cents; in 1952, .1 cent; in 1953, .36 cents; and in 1954, .1 cent. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that if it were not for the floor price on butter the price could go up as high as 80 or 90 cents in the winter months, and the full cost and more could be wiped out in one pound of butter.

I say to the minister that he is practicing a form of hypnotism. I do not know whether I should call it that, but if it is that, then he is a master of that profession. This form of hypnotism is also a big club. It is not quite so obvious when used in that form. It would appear, however, that either fear of reprisals or hesitancy to embarrass this government has softened the voices of some of the executives of some farm organizations across the country. Divide and conquer is this government's theme song, playing one group against the other, or one section of the economy against the other.

I commend the hon. member for Waterloo North on the speech he made in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, which is to be found at page 449 of *Hansard*. At least, I commend him on part of that speech, on that part having to do with vegetable oils and animal fats. I wish him luck in getting the government to accept his proposal. A similar suggestion was made to the dairy farmers of Canada in Vancouver in 1953 but they apparently did not want to accept it.

I see my time is just about up, Mr. Chairman. I just have this to say. This government has bogged down in many departments. Time is running out and the truth is catching up

[Mr. Charlton.]

to them. The farmers of Canada want a definite statement of policy, not a piecemeal day-by-day scheme.

Mr. Bryson: I am sure that after listening to the extended remarks made this morning by the Minister of Agriculture all of us feel that we have been pretty well buttered up. That is one of the products which is bringing some real benefit to agriculture because it is supported under the Agricultural Prices Support Act and I am only sorry that other livestock products are not receiving the same consideration.

I thought it was rather significant that the minister did not bring up in the house this morning the question of supporting the price of hogs in Canada. I am not going to deal with any aspect of the minister's department other than that. I am bringing this up with a view to getting some clarification from the minister because I am sure that throughout the country there are grave doubts particularly in the minds of hog producers as to why things are as they are in respect of this so-called support price we have been led to believe is in effect in this country relative to hog production.

I think we will all have to agree that the production of pork in Canada is of considerable significance in the over-all economic position of agriculture. I have a few figures here which I am going to quote a little later on to bear out that statement. This, of course, is not a question which is of particular concern to any one section of the country; hog production is pretty well scattered over the entire dominion. However, it is of some extra significance to those of us in western Canada in the light of the fact that we have great quantities of feed grain in the west which we can dispose of to our advantage through feeding that grain to hogs. Sometimes when we look at the price of pork it appears on the surface that the possibilities of obtaining a profit are remote, but when we look at the price in relation to the price of barley and the difficulty of getting rid of barley and other feed grain then the question of hog production begins to take on a completely different complexion.

I think we are all interested in seeing that prices for hogs are maintained at the highest possible level because of the fact, as I mentioned a moment ago, that we can get rid of thousands of bushels of feed grain by feeding it to hogs.

In 1946 we had a tremendous export market for hogs. In fact, I think we exported to Great Britain alone some 694 million pounds of pork in round figures. However, since that time our export markets have fallen off