

tion. Some of them have even had to go out of business. Certainly they should be represented on such a board because the control of food will touch prices as well as distribution and production. I just wanted to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the fact that I made this suggestion a year ago, and it should have been adopted then.

Coming to the amendment which has been moved, I will quote paragraph (c):

(c) to provide adequate measures whereby Canadian agriculture can make its maximum war contribution and receive a fair share of the national income.

I am supporting that. When we consider the great contribution that agriculture makes to the national income I think it will be realized that we are not asking very much when we ask for a parity price. Agriculture contributes \$996,000,000 out of a total national income of \$7,500,000,000. I am quoting from the table which was presented to the house the other day by the hon. member for Haldimand. What did the wheat growers alone do? They made a greater contribution than did any other part of the agricultural industry, a contribution greater than that of almost any other industry in Canada. Last year they produced over 600,000,000 bushels of wheat. At ninety cents Fort William, what did that amount to? I regret that only some 280,000,000 bushels of wheat will be accepted this year. Nevertheless the wheat growers have made a greater contribution than did any other part of the industry to the national income, and yet they received only 13.3 per cent of the national income, while about 40 per cent of the Canadian population are directly dependent upon agriculture. I urge again that an effort be made to bring about a parity of price and a fair share of the national income for the farmer.

I have under my hand one or two indexes which I wish to put on the record because they are most interesting. Taking the period of 1935-1939 as the yardstick at 100, we find that in August, 1939, the index stood at 100, and in August, 1941, two years later, it was 112.8. In January of this year it stood at 118. This includes food, rents, fuel, light, clothing, household furniture, and so on.

I have another index here. The Searle index gives a list of 147 items which the farmer has to buy. In 1913-14 the index stood at 100, and it now stands at 152.8. This means that these items which the farmer has to buy now cost him 52.8 per cent more than did the same items in 1913-14. Here is another index which I think is interesting. It is the index of Canadian industrial activity. In 1937 the index stood at 100. In 1940 it reached a low

of 105. In 1941 the index averaged 160, and this year, on February 1, the index stood at 185. Well, where does the farmer get off, with seventy-seven per cent increase in two years, while wheat has increased only twelve and a half per cent, that is, from 80 cents to 90 cents? It is not fair.

I have another index here which is most interesting and which I want to put on the record. It is to be found in the *Monetary Times* of February 1, and is headed "Milling and grain stocks". Listen:

Of general interest to the people of western Canada was the strength displayed by the milling and grain storage and the agricultural implements groups. Alberta Pacific Grain,—

That is a company which we know has been in difficulties for practically the last twenty years.

Alberta Pacific Grain, preferred, skyrocketed 21 points. . . . The common was up one and three-eighths cents to \$1.90, also a high.

That is, the preferred stock skyrocketed 21 points. It is also stated that Ogilvie Flour common and Lake of the Woods reached a new high. The point I wish to make is this. While grain companies stocks are going up, what about the farmers? What profits are they making? The profits of the companies have come from grain which has been taken off the farm and stored in elevators and annexes.

Then how about the milling companies? They, too, have made their profits out of the farmers' grain. But the farmers' stock has not sky-rocketed or hit a new high.

Coming to the price of grain, I am not going to take time to discuss that. It reached 90 cents last year, and last Friday we had an announcement from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) that it is going to remain at that figure this coming season. I have before me a statement put out by the department recently which shows that No. 1 wheat is quoted at Saint John at \$1.11 or \$1.12 a bushel. We know that it does not take the difference between 90 cents and \$1.12 to move it to Saint John.

In Britain the farmer is receiving \$2.12 a bushel, guaranteed to him, on one of the largest wheat crops ever harvested, over 100,000,000 bushels. In Dakota, which lies south of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the farmer receives \$1.21 less the freight but plus seven cents storage which is guaranteed to him at the rate of one cent a month for seven months. I ask hon. members, why should British and United States farmers receive so much more than our farmers? Canadian farmers are just as loyal; they are doing their part and will continue to do it as fully