

Cattle have shown a great increase in slaughterings, an increase for the same period for Western Canada of 41.1 per cent, and an increase for eastern Canada of 24.8 per cent, or an average increase for the whole country of 34.1 per cent. There has been a consistent increase in the numbers of our beef cattle in Canada year by year since 1939. In 1939 we had 4,693,500 head of beef cattle in Canada; in 1945, as of September 28, we had 6,760,400, or an approximate increase of forty-two per cent in beef cattle during the war period.

The number of hogs in Canada in 1939 was 4,363,800; in 1945, 6,025,600. We reached the peak in 1943, with 8,148,500 hogs, and that dropped this year, as I have said, to 6,025,600, which is quite a big decrease. The great decrease has taken place in western Canada, where the decrease has been far greater than in eastern Canada, but there has been a great decrease throughout the entire dominion. I am sure that the entire hog situation will have quite an effect on world marketings. I think the Department of Agriculture here have proof already of the manner in which our Danish friends are regaining the old country market for bacon.

I noticed that at a dairy convention held in the city of Winnipeg a few days ago the officials stated that whereas feed grains had increased by forty per cent in cost to the dairy producer, milk had increased in price by only 11.15 per cent, and farm wages had approximately doubled. The consequence was that a good many producers were going out of dairy production entirely. It has been pointed out in this house that the McDougall memorandum to the league of nations in 1940 showed that to equalize standards of living throughout the world, that is in order to ensure that mankind receive a greater amount of food and a higher standard of nutrition, an increase in production was required as follows; of cereals, an increase of 50 per cent; meat 90 per cent; milk and other dairy products, 125 per cent; vegetable oils, 125 per cent; fruit and vegetables, 300 per cent. It is evident that to attain national equality in nutrition and a sufficiency of food a great expansion and distribution programme must be initiated upon national and international lines.

Just yesterday the *Ottawa Citizen* carried an editorial on "Food-Planning for Plenty". It stated that the officials of the food and agriculture organization had been saying that the gamble must be taken out of the marketing of food and that the grain producers of Canada were greatly concerned over price fluctuations. The editorial had interesting facts for the Department of Agriculture here and for other

agencies that are concerned with food production in other countries at this time.

Many of us are inclined to forget or perhaps do not appreciate how much scientific research has done for agriculture in this country. I was reading an article only the other day which covered agricultural developments in the past 130 years in this country. It pointed out the crude manner in which we started with our cereals in this country, and what, every three, four or five years, scientists had brought forth for us. I am sure we should appreciate what they have done. In recent years, especially, they have developed rust-resistant wheat; and it would be difficult to estimate, even in millions of dollars, what this has meant to the grain producers of this country. In certain years during the past we would not have produced, because of rust, any wheat of our old types. Along other lines scientists have rendered a great service to us. They have inspired the confidence of farmers by the development of better varieties of grain, forage crops, fruits and vegetables, better strains of live stock, valuable farm practice methods, and workable disease and pest controls. We should not soon forget the work those scientists have done for us. Many of our producers throughout the country fail to realize this. It is certainly my belief that the officials of our treasury board do not adequately realize what these men are doing for us, by expressing that appreciation adequately in a practical form. I have been able to obtain some figures as to what our scientists in the Department of Agriculture receive, in contrast with what is paid to men similarly employed in the United States and in Great Britain, and I should like to put on record two of these comparisons which to me are enlightening. In Canada, grade 4 scientists in agriculture receive from \$3,300 to \$3,600; in the United States, \$4,730 to \$5,698; in Great Britain, from \$5,280 to \$6,160. A grade 6 scientist receives in Canada \$3,900 to \$4,500; in the United States, \$6,853 to \$7,777; in Great Britain, \$8,800 and up. That is quite a contrast. The figures are based on our currency, allowing \$1.10 for the United States dollar and \$4.40 for Great Britain's pound.

I know we are all concerned about the expenditure of public money, but I ask the committee to consider the significance of these contrasts. I have used this argument in the past, though without having the exact figures, because I believed that something should be done to keep our best types of scientists in the country and not have them going across the line in the numbers that they have gone during past years. It is something to which we must give due consideration, because these