

three years ago I was raising 1,000 hogs a year, at the present time I am not raising any. If the price of hogs went up 10 cents over what it is now I would immediately be raising 1,000 hogs a year again and a whole lot of other people would be doing the same thing to a lesser or greater extent. That will apply to every other type of agriculture. As long as your price is big enough you will have a big surplus. It seems to me in your thinking in your brief you have not accepted the fact that in having parity prices we will have marketing and production quotas.

Mr. YOUNG: In reply to that, what you envisage might be a fact. In that case, as far as I am concerned, we would be prepared to accept the consequences of it.

Mr. HARKNESS: In other words, you are prepared to accept a thorough state controlled agriculture?

Mr. YOUNG: I wouldn't say that it was necessary to go as far in that direction as you seem to envisage. Just the same the marketing quota might be used as a means of putting some restriction on production. Take, for instance, the question of hogs which you have raised which is not perhaps the thing we are supposed to discuss here. I am in the hog business too.

Mr. HARKNESS: I raised that as an example because I happen to know how it works out.

Mr. YOUNG: As far as wheat is concerned you have the factor of the weather which makes it much more variable and there is also the fact that wheat could be stored. But in the case of hogs if you had a favourable enough price it would probably be correct to say you would get an increased production.

Mr. HARKNESS: As far as wheat is concerned we always have a big export surplus.

Mr. YOUNG: Yes, but have always been able to find a market for it at some price at any rate.

The CHAIRMAN: May we go on to No. 2?

Mr. TUCKER: There is one point I would like the witness to deal with. A great deal has been said about it and I wondered what Mr. Patterson had in mind about it. He suggested that while there were people who were hungry in the world there should be no thought of putting quotas and controls on the production of the Canadian people. A lot of people who are hungry today have absolutely nothing to give us for the food products that we already have in oversupply. I was wondering what the idea of the farmers' unions was in that regard,—is it that we should buy the food products from the Canadian farmers and give them to these people and tax the Canadian people generally for a system of feeding these teeming populations that are hungry today or what you had in mind in that regard?

Mr. PATTERSON: Mr. Tucker, that was the point that I brought up and my approach to the situation is still the same. You suggest that these people have nothing to give in return for the goods that we might supply them. I suggest they could give us a terrific amount of trouble if they remain on the bread-line.

Mr. TUCKER: You mean provide them with the food to keep them quiet—is that the idea?

Mr. PATTERSON: I would suggest that rather than being concerned about having the munitions that are necessary to keep these people quiet that we have the food they need and they would be quiet and happy.

The CHAIRMAN: Let me suggest this is under No. 4.