

duction of grain and the shipment of wheat they would not let their land lie idle; so far as possible they would devote their energies to the production of some kind of live stock. We felt that the live stock production which they could get into most easily was pigs and sheep. Inasmuch as the sheep market in the United Kingdom can at the present time be supplied by other parts of the empire we felt it was in the interests of Canadian agriculture to offer the greatest opportunity for the development of our pig industry and for the benefit of our pig producers.

Let us deal with the other side of the argument, that the production of wheat must result in a survival of the fittest. Could anything be more advantageous to the wheat farmers of Canada—if indeed it is a case of a survival of the fittest—than that he should be given a specific preference? We must remember that other countries desiring to ship grain to the United Kingdom have to pay a toll of six cents per bushel. That is one of the particular reasons we were anxious to have the preference placed on Canadian wheat. Not only that, but what happened in 1929 and what made it so difficult for Canada to sell her wheat in the market of the United Kingdom is well within the memory of hon. members—especially the Russian and the Argentine competition. This preference and trade treaty will remedy this.

Reverting to bacon, I have some further comments. After reading the article in the agreement concerning bacon, and after reading that the United Kingdom had promised that after she had received her report from the pig commission she would take steps, as early as possible, to raise the price of bacon in the old country by quantitative restrictions, the right hon. leader of the opposition used the expression: "if this means anything." In one breath the right hon. gentleman questions the honour of ministers of the government of the United Kingdom, despite the fact that Right hon. Sir John Gilmour, at that time Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, stated that on behalf of the government of the United Kingdom he pledged the United Kingdom government that the report of the pig commission would be submitted as early as possible, and that the steps necessary to restrict the import of bacon into the United Kingdom would be taken as early as possible.

There could be no better assurance than that. If that assurance does not mean anything, if it is not one worth while, I do not know what assurance could be. Why did we stipulate the quantity of bacon, and name 280,000,000 pounds or 2,500,000 hundredweight,

—a hundredweight being one hundred and twelve pounds? This is the reason: Before and during the conference there was discussed in the old country the possibility not only of putting a restriction upon bacon from foreign countries entering the United Kingdom, but of a bacon and meat restriction from the dominions. That is best shown by a reading of the Australian agreement in which there is an agreement to quantitative restrictions on beef, mutton and lamb for 1933. I realize if our farmers are to go into bacon production they must not have a wall held in front of them which would have the effect of allowing them to increase production only to the extent of 50,000,000 or 100,000,000 pounds per year for export. So that they might have some assurance of permanency we were able to get this amount of 280,000,000 pounds. And that does not mean the limit. There is nothing said to prevent their going beyond that amount, until the British government acts on the report of the pig commission, but this amount is fixed. In this connection may I point out that the hon. member for Melville, discussing this question the other night, made the statement that this stimulation of bacon production would cause Poland to produce more, Czechoslovakia to produce more, Sweden, Denmark and Russia to produce more, and the result would be to depress the market. But that would not be the case if there was quantitative restriction, because it would be no advantage to them to produce hogs for the United Kingdom when they are to be held down to a specified proportion of what the United Kingdom imported.

In that connection the hon. member for Melville criticized me for an increased bacon production policy initiated two years ago. I will repeat, as I have done here on two other occasions, that in that policy I did not advocate greater pig production. I did the opposite. I did everything I could to emphasize the fact that farmers were going to produce more pigs whether we would or not, on account of the high price of bacon in comparison with the low price of grain. But I felt that if it was inevitable that there would be greater hog production; inexperienced people would not produce the quality necessary for export and therefore there would be a great quantity of hogs that could not be exported, and the piling up of these would depress our market. Our policy made it easier for them to get the right kind of pigs. I did that for this purpose. There are in Ontario, especially in central and western Ontario, people who produce pigs of a bacon quality unsurpassed even in Denmark. Some counties in Ontario produce as high as ninety per cent bacon and select bacon