

Agricultural Products Act

to have controls to give a fair break to the working man. But that is not a permanent solution, and we have never said it was.

"Palliative" means a temporary or partial relief. That is the same kind of salve which they have been spreading all over this country. It is temporary relief, but it does not cure the situation. Is that not in contrast with the view taken by the leader of that party in the radio speech I have just referred to? I would suggest that they get together and do a redraft of their policy. Food subsidies in Great Britain have doubled since 1945 and I quote from an article in the *Globe and Mail* of February 8 as follows:

Food Subsidies up in Britain

London, February 7 (CP)—Sir Stafford Cripps, chancellor of the exchequer, said in the House of Commons the latest estimate of the cost of food subsidies during the present fiscal year is £484 million.

Viscount Hinchinbrooke, Conservative member of parliament for Dorset South, asked why the chancellor had not kept to a September estimate that the cost would be £470 million.

"It is due to an increase in prices," said Sir Stafford.

The cost of subsidies has risen from £226 million in 1945-46.

Taxes in Britain have soared beyond belief. The government in Britain has overspent its last year's budget by nearly \$1,000 million. That is the result of the policies of the socialist labour government which has had a chance to practise what the socialist C.C.F. party here has tried to preach without too much success. I quote again from the *Globe and Mail* of February 14 as follows:

"Wild Miscalculation" in U.K. spending Charged

London, February 13 (CP)—The Labour government this week must answer Conservative charges that it is guilty of "wild miscalculation" in overspending by £221,500,000 in the present fiscal year.

Many times we have heard references made to the identical policies of these two parties, the C.C.F. party here and the Labour party in England. We used to hear considerable quotations from New Zealand, but we have not heard so much of that lately. We have not heard so much about Britain lately either. The socialist C.C.F. party now claim that they are not going to socialize the farms and that controls are only a palliative measure. Is it that the socialist C.C.F. party is now trying to hedge a little to the right and push the government out of its place as a middle line party? If the efficiency of that course can be judged by the degree of success in the results of the bill we are now dealing with, I suggest that it will not be very satisfactory. With the exception of eggs, the production of each food product has materially decreased. It is hardly necessary for me to quote these figures as I stated them on March 23, 1948, in a speech which I made on the second

[Mr. Charlton.]

reading of this bill last year, as recorded on page 2514 of *Hansard*.

It is quite generally known that this government did not fill the contract for bacon or cheese in the years 1946, 1947 and 1948 and it is highly improbable that the 1949 contract will be filled either. Why? Because the farmers are not satisfied with the outlook for the future. They have asked repeatedly for an agricultural products marketing act which would allow producer organizations to make their own long-term contracts or whatever they agreed upon. The Conservative party passed such an act in 1934.

Mr. Lesage: What about provincial autonomy?

Mr. Charlton: It was thrown out by the Liberal government in 1937. An agricultural marketing act has been a part of this party's program ever since that time. Only now, after repeated demands, has the minister seen fit to bring forward such legislation. Could it be that, while prices were good and products in short supply, little salesmanship was required, but now that the going is getting a little difficult the minister, who has posed as a supersalesman, very conveniently waits until now to hand the responsibility over to the producer boards? I contend that, the Agricultural Products Act having served its usefulness as a price control measure, the minister now throws the marketing problem in the lap of the producers in a manner very unbecoming to one who has so persistently repeated praises of his own accomplishments in the field of marketing.

Under this bill the minister has complete power over all agricultural products except wheat.

Mr. Gardiner: May I ask a question?

Mr. Charlton: As long as you do not close the debate.

Mr. Gardiner: I will not close the debate. Does my hon. friend agree that the net income of farmers last year was \$500 million higher than in any other year in the history of our country?

Mr. Charlton: That is gross income, not net.

Mr. Gardiner: That is net income.

Mr. Charlton: No, not net.

Mr. Gardiner: Net income is up \$500 million.

Mr. Charlton: That is beside the point, anyway. When a producer produces half as much and gets twice as much for it he is naturally getting more money gross, but if it costs twice as much to produce it he is not getting as much net.