

I am hopeful that out of the discussion in this committee will come suggestions which I can take to the government the following day as recommendations for amendments to the regulations. If that is at all possible I should like to get it done by to-morrow evening.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is not like the laws of the Medes and Persians; the minister can change the regulations.

Mr. GARDINER: The regulations—apart from the principle involved, which is the making of acreage payments for doing certain things—may be changed as a result of experience in putting them into effect.

Mr. COLDWELL: Would it be possible, with the consent of the committee, to have these regulations read clause by clause, without our having to listen to a good many speeches before the regulations are considered? I agree with the minister that it is the regulations we wish to understand. Could we agree that at eight o'clock to-night, when we reassemble, these regulations will be tabled?

Mr. GARDINER: I shall be prepared to place the regulations before the committee at any time that might be agreed.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am making that suggestion, that the regulations be taken up clause by clause.

Mr. GARDINER: If some agreement could be reached, I should be glad to have that done.

Mr. McNEVIN: Is there any possibility of the bonus on coarse grains being removed?

Mr. GARDINER: I am just going to try to tell my hon. friend that there is a reason why it should not be.

When the Minister of Trade and Commerce and I spoke on this matter some days ago, I can understand why some hon. members might have thought that certain details should have been dealt with at greater length than actually was the case. On a number of occasions, however, I have endeavoured to emphasize the fact that at times negotiations are going on between ourselves and Britain, or between ourselves and the United States, or among all three, which make it absolutely impossible for us to say anything with regard to what we may have in mind in respect of a certain matter. It just happened that this was one of those occasions. It was impossible to discuss freely two weeks ago what we can discuss freely to-day, and it is information in that regard that I wish to place on *Hansard* at the moment.

Earlier in the proceedings of this committee there was some discussion with regard to the necessity, or otherwise, for the production of

more coarse grains. So far as barley is concerned, in 1940 we produced 104,256,000 bushels, our highest production since 1930, when it amounted to 135,160,000 bushels. Since 1930 the figure has varied from 63,000,000 bushels to 103,000,000 bushels in 1939, so that last year our production was one million bushels greater than that of the year previous. The relative change in bushelage has been maintained fairly well in all provinces. With regard to oats, our production in 1940 was 380,526,000 bushels, and in 1939 it was 384,407,000 bushels, the highest since 1935. Prior to 1935, there was no higher production as far back as 1929. Therefore it was not a low production of coarse grains last year that created the situation which existed in either eastern or western Canada. The difficulty arose rather as a result of the increased production of hogs, which in 1940 amounted to 5,881,000. The production for the three previous years was as follows:

1939.....	4,294,000
1938.....	3,886,000
1937.....	3,963,000

In no year since 1931 have we had within a million of the number of hogs we had on June 1, 1940. I make that statement in order to point out that when the number of hogs produced in one year increases by almost two-fifths as compared with the previous year, it requires two-fifths more grain to feed them. When you have more cattle—and we have more cattle—and more of every other kind of live stock, it takes more grain to feed them. So it is not a question of getting along with the amount of grain that was grown in preceding years; it is a question of having more coarse grains produced if we are going to be able to feed more hogs. Last year we had not enough coarse grains to feed our hogs. As a matter of fact, we brought into Canada from the Argentine alone over two million bushels of corn, for other than commercial purposes; that is, more than 2,000,000 more than we brought in from the Argentine during the preceding year. In other words, it is a question of producing the grain necessary in order to feed the live stock that we require to feed, more particularly hogs.

I now come to the announcement I wish to make in connection with hogs. Last fall and prior to that, we were in the difficult position of having been told by Great Britain that she did not wish us to produce more hogs in Canada because of any belief we might have that at some time during the war she would require more bacon and ham from Canada. We were told at that time that this would have to be a matter for our own judgment, that they could not say what changes might take place which might call for the production