

Rheume). I am sorry he is not in his seat. On October 25 last, referring to me, he made the following statement:

During the speech of my good friend from Compton he has declared that the farmers of this country should be proud of the prices they are obtaining for their butter, and I defy the member for Compton to go and repeat these words in his county.

Let me tell him that I never uttered such words, and the hon. member knew it when he said it. He knew it because he referred to Hansard, and he had only to refer to page 416 and he would have seen that what I said was this:

It will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that the action taken by this government on behalf of Canadian farmers has resulted in our farmers getting more for their butter than are the farmers of any other country in the world.

I wish to point out that the hon. member for St. Johns-Iberville, deliberately misquoted me; he sought to put in my mouth words that I never uttered. But I remind the house that he did not dispute the figures I gave; neither did any other hon. member opposite, because they were the correct figures. He challenged me to go back to my constituency and say words that I never pronounced here. I challenge the hon. member—well, perhaps I should not say that, because the hon. member for St. Johns-Iberville has proven that he can say anything; but I defy any hon. member to prove to the house that the figures I gave on the 20th of October last were not accurate figures for the month I mentioned.

What has been the situation in regard to butter in Canada since I gave these figures, and what is it to-day? The condition has continually improved, so much so that to-day there is a difference of between six and seven cents in favour of Canada as compared with United States prices and over ten cents a pound as compared with London prices. Let me read to the house some short comments made by two Montreal papers on the butter situation. These comments were written after the answer given by the right hon. the Prime Minister to my question relative to New Zealand butter en route to Canada a few days ago. *Le Bulletin des Agriculteurs* dated the 21st of March made the following comments:

Last Monday answering a question of Mr. Sam Gobeil, Right Hon. R. B. Bennett gave assurance to the house that these importations of butter would be controlled under the terms of the treaty with New Zealand because he considered these importations prejudicial to the dairy industry. The occasion seems to be favourable to examine what that protection that some are trying to discredit is actually worth to us. Without this treaty and the protection

that it affords us butter would sell to-day in Canada for 16 cents per pound, the price of butter is actually 18 cents in United States or 22 cents in Canadian funds, on the English market the best New Zealand butter is selling to-day for 14·54 in Canadian funds.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the comments made by that newspaper in Montreal which since its foundation has been looked upon by the farmers of the province of Quebec as the watchdog of their interests. But if some hon. members think that the opinion of this newspaper may not be impartial, let me give them now the comments of the Liberal organ in the city of Montreal, *Le Canada*, on the 21st of March. I have the newspaper article here, and this is a translation:

New Zealand has always the resource of directing her butter to another market. There is no question of denouncing the treaty between the two governments. Their butter enters Canada by paying a duty of 5 cents per pound. The price of butter in Montreal to-day is higher than in New York, and even much more than the English price where New Zealand sells nearly all her butter. The highest price in Montreal to-day is 25 cents, in New York Saturday the price was 18 cents or 22 cents in Canadian funds. The average price paid on the English market for the best New Zealand butter is 14·54 in Canadian funds, so that, lacking action by the government, it would permit New Zealand to flood our market with butter, and would smash the prevailing present prices.

Now, sir, could there be a better compliment paid to this government than that? And it is paid by one of the greatest Liberal newspapers published in Montreal. Do hon. members opposite believe that such a happy condition was brought about by chance? I know they are not so narrow minded, they know better, but so does the Canadian farmer. The Canadian farmer knows that this situation was brought about largely by the efforts of the hon. Minister of Agriculture in 1930, by his constant supervision of the market, and by the arrangement arrived at by which no foreign butter would be offered for sale in Canada for less than 31 cents during the winter of 1930-31. It was brought about by the foresight of this government when the New Zealand treaty was drafted, the terms of which permit this government to take action, as it will on this occasion, without endangering or cancelling the whole treaty; preventing the flooding of our country with large quantities of butter and lowering our price to the London price. If hon. gentlemen opposite were in power to-day or if the same condition that existed in 1930 were still prevailing, as this Liberal newspaper said, the price of butter in Canada would be that of