

I think we must maintain and conserve our land so that we will be working in the interest of the land rather than in the interest of expediency. In the past we have been free and easy with the land and we have wasted our substance for the expediency of the moment. I think this has changed in the last 20 years very effectively. We find today that farmers are more conservation minded. We find today contour farming going on, and the use of preserving cover crops against wind blowing and so on. I think we have done a magnificent job in the last 100 years, and that the results in North America have proven it. But I would not want to see any one area of science emphasized at the expense of the others. To do this would be quite fatal. Does this answer your question?

Mr. OTTO: Yes, it does. I certainly recommend very wide distribution of this article. I think this is a very good pamphlet.

Mr. WHITE-STEVENS: Thank you.

Mr. RYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I feel a little depressed sitting here and hearing this story today, because here we have an agricultural scientist on the one hand producing more and more food, while on the other hand we have my own profession, medical science, doing away with so many of the epidemics—or at least trying to do away with them, with the end in view of increasing the span of life. Surely with those two intentions coming together we have a two-legged table which is bound to collapse somewhere. Because if we keep on increasing the amount of food we can raise, and if we keep on increasing the power of medical science so that people may live longer, with healthier birth rates, then there is only one conclusion we can all come to.

So surely it is not a complete argument to say that we should produce with more and more land without first dealing with the other side of it. It leaves me quite a bit depressed listening to more and more of the story, to think that with a greater increase in food we will have more and more people to feed. Where are we going to end up with our 6 billion of population and with this rate of growth?

Mr. ENNS: I would not remain very depressed. The facts are there, and Dr. White-Stevens has said that they are now documented. But surely these are exciting things in our time. It is wonderful to think of the advancement of knowledge in our day. The way we are working is bringing about terrific improvement.

Mr. RYNARD: Are we all going to have to take a big stick to one another when we get so close together?

Mr. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think we are getting away from the main reason for our meeting this morning.

Mr. RYNARD: No. We are trying to do away with these pests so that we can grow more and more acres of food. But surely there will come about an impasse somewhere. I realize it is of no particular concern to the meeting this morning, but surely they must come together somewhere.

Mr. ENNS: I wonder if we are not getting outside the scope of our meeting this morning?

Mr. RYNARD: I admit that we are, but those two effects are coming together somewhere, and they are going to collide.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we might return to the more basic consideration of the brief by the committee. Are there any questions brought out by the brief?

Mr. ENNS: As to the brief I was interested in the labelling costs which could be placed on the research of compounds, and with the field performance of the toxicologist. There is always the need to figure out what cost you are able to place on it. You say that this would cost from \$150,000 and so on? I