

organization to prevent aggression. To that extent we can excuse the government for not having a long term policy. But, Mr. Speaker, we were given a policy a year ago. Judging from what has appeared in the press it has been altered in the meantime. I am sure we shall look forward with interest to the explanation of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Claxton) for that change.

We have been placed in a ludicrous position. From the point of view of effectiveness we were the fourth striking power in the war, and we were in it from the time it began. We were welcomed on the battlefields, but we are excluded from the peace talks. Our soldiers were asked to fight, occupy a place in decisive battles and help to win wars. When it comes to peace making we are gracefully accorded only the privilege of submitting our views. Either we are a part of this world organization or we are not, and until all the mysticism is cleared away about what we are—a little, middle or great power, a power on our own, a power working in cooperation with other British countries, a North American power in association with the United States—until our government makes up its mind on some such questions as these, who can say whether our defence money is wasted or not?

As was to be expected, the government referred in the speech from the throne to the question of employment. In this paragraph the government speaks of our present high rate of employment. It says it is over 30 per cent higher than it was in 1939. That sounds quite high until we realize that in 1939 it was not very high. What we want to know, and what I hope the government will be able to tell us, is what is the government's policy with respect to labour-industrial relations and to employment after the present high demand is over. That is a problem which is raising questions of fear in the minds not only of workers but also of employers, and I am sure of the government as well. Its own machinery has to a considerable degree failed to meet the needs. Whenever we pick up a newspaper we find that the sky is darkened in some part of the country by an industrial dispute.

What I said with respect to trade applies in this instance. Instead of boasting about trade and employment figures, arising from entirely artificial conditions, where we tax ourselves to get money to lend to somebody else to buy our exports, and thereby boasting about our trade and employment figures, the government should have an employment policy for tomorrow and later on as well as for today. I am not aware of any such plans. The government says that it has a plan to try

to meet that situation, but in the meantime those plans have broken down. If it has a policy it is keeping it to itself as a dark secret. What is to be done about employment in the future after the immediate and urgent necessities of reconstruction are met? We are simply told that if and when all the provinces have accepted the government's financial terms it will meet the provinces with a programme of public investment and social security. But in the meantime that proposal is not moving forward. The government has no policy now except a policy of drift a policy of wait and see and hope that something will come out of that situation.

In one paragraph the government deals with the situation with respect to our primary products of the farm, the fisheries, the mines and the forests. I wish for a minute to touch on the question of agriculture, the situation facing the agricultural industry of the country. For years the government, through its numerous boards, has had complete control over prices for farm products and the cost of things the farmers buy. It has regulated and controlled the slaughtering of live stock. It has regulated and controlled the import and export of seeds, feeds and fertilizers. It has controlled the marketing of grains, it has controlled and regulated the export of live stock and live stock products. It has rationed important foodstuffs. It has entered into long-term export food agreements at guaranteed prices and paid direct and indirect subsidies to farmers. Yet the over-all net farming income of Canada has been declining since 1944, in spite of the highest domestic and foreign demand for farm products in our history. The government has been guilty of misleading the British government with overoptimistic statements of what we can produce and supply. The government has entered into long-term food export agreements with Britain which it is impossible to fulfil without prohibiting exports to the United States, maintaining strict rationing in Canada, permanently controlling if not completely prohibiting farm exports, discouraging any increase in the acreage of wheat, and subsidizing our food exports, because the prices to Britain on some of them are below the cost of production.

In 1940 Canada exported 345,000,000 pounds of bacon to Britain and in 1946 entered into a contract for 450,000,000 pounds, later reduced to 350,000,000. We failed to meet the reduced contract, I am informed, by over 100,000,000 pounds.

The production of eggs declined last year, having fallen to 23,000,000 dozen short of the export agreement with Britain.