

advertising in farm publications to assist farm women in their home and farm duties and allied war work.

On page 74 there is another advertising item for \$555; another advertising item of \$15,000; an item of \$12,000 for advertising a sheep raising programme. On page 75 there are two or three more advertising items, including an item of \$22,000 for advertising to stimulate live stock production. I am not going into details as to who got this money, although it would be interesting to know who it was in Montreal who got the most of it. My point is, does the minister really need to carry on this expensive advertising this year, or will the advertising that was paid for last year suffice? The amount spent on advertising does seem out of all proportion when you have boards set up, with inspectors and key men going all over the country. When I was at home at Easter I stopped at an hotel in a small town, and standing outside were eight or ten cars. I said to the hotel-keeper, "You must be doing a good business, with so many cars outside." He said, "Come on out with me and look at them." Half of them were departmental cars, three of them belonging to the Department of Agriculture. They are doing a lot of advertising and your boards are doing a lot of advertising, so that I think these advertising agencies should not receive again this year the amounts that were paid them last year. The best advertising we can get with respect to farm production in Canada is a fair price, and that is all the farmer asks—a fair and square deal and a parity price. There has just come to hand to-day the Searle index giving comparative prices on 147 items and the price shown for farm products is 102 instead of 156. A fair price for the farmer is the best advertising of all.

When we come to the individual items we shall have questions to ask. It is our responsibility to help the minister get the necessary production of food to assist in bringing the war to a successful conclusion. But I think, too, we all want to see the agriculturist, who is carrying on the largest industry in the country, get a square deal.

Mr. HLYNKA: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the consideration of individual items in a more orderly fashion I should like to say a few words.

The Minister of Agriculture seems to be very well versed in his subject and has a lot of statistical information at his finger-tips whenever he is asked a question. He also delivers some very good speeches on the floor of this house. But for some reason or another the farmers are never set at ease by the speeches

[Mr. Perley.]

which the minister delivers, and I believe that the results which the farmers received from their operations justify their feelings. I should like to hear the minister give this committee and the country the assurance that farm income in Canada after the war will be maintained at a high level.

Mr. EVANS: It is higher this year than ever before in the history of this country.

Mr. HLYNKA: I quite agree that the income which the farmers have been receiving during war time is considerably higher than that which they received before the war, but one or two years of better prices for farm products do not place the farmer in a position where he feels safe and is able to meet his daily obligations.

Mr. EVANS: The farmers of Alberta are liquidating their mortgages this year.

Mr. HLYNKA: Yes, but Alberta has a good government. That is the difference.

Mr. DUPUIS: Twenty-five dollars a month.

Mr. HLYNKA: If I may proceed, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister to tell us how he proposes to keep farm income at a high level. Has he any formula? Or is he unable to give the committee and the country the assurance that farm income will be maintained at a high level?

Would the minister also tell the committee whether he still entertains the view that agricultural prosperity depends upon and can only be maintained by foreign trade? That is the view which this government held in the past. Our farmers were told that they could not possibly expect better times because we could not sell our wheat abroad. Will the minister tell the committee whether this government feels that immediately after the war the Canadian people can be assured of an adequate income, or must they again hear the excuse that because we cannot sell our products abroad the people must go hungry at home?

Would the minister also tell the committee whether or not he is satisfied that under his administration it will be possible to make available to the farmers sufficient credit to enable them to carry on their farming operations as they would like to do? I must say that in the past, and it is partly the case now, this government has chosen to put the farmers on a sort of relief system. The farmers were forced to live on relief, and they still do, whether it be in the form of subsidies or other assistance that the government gives the farmers from time to time. I believe in subsidies for both the consumer and the producer. But first of all we must endeavour to