

*The Address—Mr. Gardiner*

Having said this, Mr. Speaker, may I add that in spite of the fact that you can keep a man eight times as long on grain as you can keep him on beef fed from the grain, and five times as long on grain as you can on pork fed from the grain, in an emergency, over a long period you cannot have a balanced ration composed entirely of cereals for a people. When we look at the activities of Britain since the war began and match them with activities in this country, we must keep that thought in mind.

Prior to the war Britain was a producer of live-stock products in great quantity. She produced cattle. She paid a bonus on cattle for years before the war started, in order that people might import them and keep them walking around in the pastures for at least three months in order that they might be available in the form of fresh meat if necessary. But since the war started Britain has been insisting upon her people ploughing up the great pasture lands upon which cattle were pastured, lands which were the basis of the production of dairy products, and has insisted upon the production of cereals. The whole reason for this action arises out of what I stated a few moments ago. If submarine warfare is successful in blockading the British isles for a month or two months, cereal products during that emergency will keep a man much longer, pound for pound, than will meat products, or even dairy products, produced from the grain. Britain having taken this action in self-defence, she has said to those of us who are her friends and who are further removed from the scenes of battle, "Produce other necessities for us." And in spite of the fact that we can store foods in grain form cheaper and more effectively than we can any other kind of food, we are asking our Canadian people to produce meat—to produce pork, beef, cheese, butter; and milk which can be powdered and sent over to the British people at once.

What have we done? We have doubled the production of hogs slaughtered in this country. Seventy per cent of all hogs marketed in Canada are consumed in the British isles. When anyone says that there is a shortage of hogs in Canada, then I point out to him that we have a surplus of seventy per cent because of the policy being followed in this country at the present time.

What about cheese? At the beginning of the war we had a production of cheese which was very low as compared with present production. We started in with an objective of some time reaching 200,000,000 pounds. This is the amount of cheese we produced in Canada about the year 1900. We reached that

[Mr. Gardiner.]

200,000,000 pounds, Mr. Speaker, this year. We reached that 200,000,000 pounds—and with what result? More than seventy per cent of all we produce is surplus and goes to Britain to help feed the British people, who in turn are growing cereals in order that they may meet any emergency which may be forced upon their country.

What about cattle? The other day when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was speaking in the debate a question was asked him across the floor of the house. He stated that the reason for rationing of butter in Canada, and the reason it had been suggested it might be necessary to have rationing of beef, was that we had been attempting to fulfil our trade agreement with Great Britain. Since that time at least two hon. members, during the time I have been in my seat, have challenged that statement. One went so far as to say it was incorrect.

Anyone who understands agriculture as it is carried on in Ontario and Quebec knows that there is a close association between the price which prevails for cheese and butter, and the production of those two products. Everyone in the house knows, too, that when the price paid for cheese is 20 cents a pound, and premiums and subsidies on top of that bring the price up to 24 cents a pound, a price lower than 40 cents for a pound of butter will not bring about an increase in its production in this country.

If we go back to the year before last, what do we find? Every agent from Britain who came to this country, every person who discussed the question on this side of the Atlantic, and every agent of ours who went to the other side and brought back a message to Canada, stated that Britain required cheese and wanted it even as against butter. We have shipped no butter to Britain since the war started. But butter is made from exactly the same kind of milk as is cheese. And when we pay a price in agreement with Great Britain which induces the production of cheese at the expense of butter, of course we render necessary the control of the consumption of butter in this country. This is exactly what was implied in the remarks of the Prime Minister the other day.

When I attempted to correct a statement made in the house by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross), he said: But I am talking about beef. Well, the same is true, in another way, with regard to beef. When a man sits down to his dinner table and finds on it a roast of pork, unless he is a Yorkshireman he probably does not find a roast of beef there too. If he is a Yorkshireman he may also find the beef. However as a rule when we eat pork