

Mr. NICHOLS: No. It is the commercial corn which needs the tariff. We mentioned that in our brief in June. Very little seed corn goes to the United States. We are vitally interested in commercial corn, because indirectly the seed corn benefits. If you go back to your tariff, the expanding industry in the rest of Ontario needs all the assistance it can have. They will come through, but do not throw any stumbling blocks on them by cutting the tariff and putting them under the United States bulk shipments of corn. Also, there is what is called free corn which is sold at considerably less money again. However, that is a long story.

Mr. THOMAS: Would you consider a high tariff to be an advantage to the corn industry in Ontario?

Mr. NICHOLS: It would be very advantageous. It appears to me that we should have a tariff on corn coming into Canada the same as that which we have to pay on corn going into the United States. In the brief we have pointed out that on beef it is three cents a pound and on hogs $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents. These other industries have a certain amount of protection. It would appear to be only fair and reasonable that producers of any other commodity should be given the same protection, because others are buying corn and using it in their business. If it is sold below its value, because of too low a tariff, then they are getting an advantage which I do not believe they are entitled to.

Mr. THOMAS: You mentioned you have been assured by the minister that the tariff will not be taken off. Is there a time limit on this or does it extend into the foreseeable future?

Mr. NICHOLS: Mr. MacKenzie as secretary of this committee has received a letter from the hon. Mr. Mitchell Sharp pointing out that they had no intention of removing the tariff. When we were down here before, the hon. Mr. Hays assured us that in the negotiations they were not going to change the tariff, particularly with the situation being what it was. The tariff on United States corn coming in here was only eight cents and it was 25 cents going the other way.

We would be very happy if this were to be increased, but we understand it is not government policy and may not be right for world trade at all.

Mr. THOMAS: Could you give me the acreage planted, comparing the acreage of 1963 with that of 1964? The bushels have already been compared.

Mr. NICHOLS: You mean for corn?

Mr. THOMAS: Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS: The acreage last year for corn was 800,000 acres, while the year before that, it was around 600,000 acres. We are told there is a potential of $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acres of corn land in Ontario with the new hybrids and so on.

Mr. THOMAS: I have one more question. Can barley be substituted for corn in these feed mixtures readily?

Mr. NICHOLS: Many users of feed prefer corn because they have become acquainted with it, and because there is a higher protein value to it. But here again I am not qualified to speak in regard to it. I would not want to try to improve our position in regard to corn to the detriment of the barley man.

Mr. THOMAS: I think I know the answer to this question, but I would like to have it on the record. Is your federation of agriculture established in Kent?

Mr. NICHOLS: Yes, we have one in Kent.

Mr. THOMAS: Have they taken any part in trying to persuade the government to promote or assist in building government storage at Chatham?

Mr. NICHOLS: Not to my knowledge.