

thought we would dispose of the Farmer's Union this morning. We have had a very general discussion now, the rest is detail. Are there really many questions to be asked on the other aspects?

Mr. YOUNG: We are quite prepared to stay here for a few days.

The CHAIRMAN: The members have engagements in other committees and in the House, and this is a special day. I do not want to be too hard on the members.

Mr. TUCKER: What is planned for tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN: There are two meetings planned for tomorrow, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Perhaps we should go on until 1.00 o'clock and see how much is left. Is that agreeable?

Agreed.

Mr. CHARLTON: Could we have a meeting this afternoon or evening?

The CHAIRMAN: Not this evening. If we can finish this morning then we will not have to meet until tomorrow.

Mr. CHARLTON: This is relevant to the subject I brought up the first thing this morning. You are proposing to have two meetings tomorrow, one in the forenoon and one in the afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON: And it is likely that the bills having reference to agriculture will be in the House tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: I will have a conference with the leader and try to arrange it differently. The idea is to have the P.F.R.A. bill this afternoon or evening, and that is why I planned only one meeting for today, this morning. Tomorrow I think they are going on to something else and not on those bills. At any rate I will see the leader. I quite agree with you if at all possible I do not think we should meet while these bills are before the House. We still have 25 minutes. If we could go on until 1.00 o'clock possibly we could adjourn until tomorrow.

Mr. HARKNESS: There is one other point on these general proposals I would like to raise, Mr. Chairman. I think that one of the inherent basic difficulties in these proposals is just hinted at the top of page 5 where you say:

Full-scale production should be encouraged except in the case of temporary surpluses when the application of production and/or marketing quotas might be considered advisable.

Is not the actual situation this that as long as the price is favourable you are in Canada, as far as agricultural production is concerned, never going to have a temporary surplus; they are going to be permanent surpluses. In other words, we have the capacity here to always produce a great deal more food than we can consume in this country at the present time or in the foreseeable future. As a result if you have a sufficiently good price so that people can make money at it you are always going to have surpluses to the needs of our own country and therefore your parity price proposals are going to apply only to a certain segment of our production and the rest is going to have to be exported at lower prices. In order to prevent these big surpluses I do not think there is going to be any question of having production and marketing quotas just very occasionally from time to time. I think if you put forward this proposal you have got to accept the fact that you would have to have production and marketing quotas as a permanent feature of our agriculture. In other words, agriculture would cease to be free. An example of what would be found to happen is in Alberta at the present time if the price of hogs were sufficiently favourable you would have a production of two or three times as many hogs as at the present time. Take my own case;