

hogs, and we did not think it fair to them to allow people to go into the increased production of bacon, without or against our advice, producing hogs of a quality that would be detrimental to and would offset the work these people had done in scientific bacon production.

The next item that I will touch upon briefly is apples. We cannot supply the whole market of the United Kingdom with apples, so in relation to that product we have a different basis from either bacon quota or wheat preference. Our preference on apples is 4s. 6d. a hundred, that is roughly \$1 to \$1.25 a barrel. Our chief competitor in apples in the United Kingdom is the United States, and over half their apples are not of high quality. Anyone who has given this subject any thought will readily see that a specific duty is more effective against the lower grade article than the higher grade article. The result is that, on apples being sold by the United States to the United Kingdom at prices in the neighbourhood of \$1.25 to \$2 a barrel, this duty will be almost prohibitive; so it is estimated conservatively that it will give us an increased market in the United Kingdom for approximately 500,000 barrels.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken for forty minutes.

Mr. GEORGE W. McPHEE (Yorkton): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) has given us the same speech that he delivered in South Huron, and the people of South Huron gave the answer. If the hon. Minister of Agriculture is correct in saying that markets have been increased for the Canadian producer, why is agriculture in Canada in the condition in which it is to-day? Some time ago the minister recommended a sow policy; now he recommends reduced acreage for wheat.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): No.

Mr. McPHEE: He did not say it in so many words, but he intimated it. That statement of the minister, Mr. Speaker, is the best answer to his whole argument. If the Canadian producer of wheat is going to get the benefit of six cents a bushel in the United Kingdom market why does the minister recommend that the Canadian farmer cut down the acreage of wheat?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not be interrupted without his consent, unless it is a question of privilege. Let us see what it is.

[Mr. R. Weir.]

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The question of privilege is this: I have been quoted as saying that I advocated restriction of wheat acreage, which I did not.

Mr. McPHEE: Inferentially my hon. friend said that. Now let us analyse properly these agreements. To do so it is necessary for us to go back to 1930. Before 1930 we had eight years of prosperity in this country. Wheat sold in Canada then at \$1.10 a bushel, butter at 30 cents a pound, eggs at 25 cents a dozen. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture and the right hon. leader of the government (Mr. Bennett), taking advantage of the condition of unemployment, went up and down this country saying that the panacea for the troubles we were suffering from was higher tariffs, and the people of Canada took them at their word and put them in office. What do we find to-day after two and a half years of Tory high tariff methods? Wheat not \$1.10 but 30 cents; butter not 30 cents a pound, but 10 cents; eggs not 25 cents a dozen, but 7 cents; butter 10 cents a pound; axle grease 20 cents.

Then we had the imperial conference fiasco of 1930, summed up as humbug. Then we have the imperial conference of 1932, the foundation of these agreements.

What is the agreement, in effect as respect to wheat? That the United Kingdom will impose a duty of six cents a bushel on wheat coming from foreign countries, in order to give Canada a preference in its market. The article in the agreement which deals with that is as follows—for the purpose of my argument I wish to put it on record:

Article 4. It is agreed that the duty on either wheat in grain, copper, zinc or lead as provided in this agreement may be removed if at any time empire producers of wheat in grain, copper, zinc and lead respectively are unable or unwilling to offer these commodities on first sale in the United Kingdom at prices not exceeding the world prices and in quantities sufficient to supply the requirements of the United Kingdom consumers.

The other night the hon. member for Long Lake (Mr. Cowan) made this statement: Where is Canada going to sell her wheat if not in the United Kingdom? I am not surprised at loose statements coming from that quarter, but I am surprised that the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Willis) should take up the statement as he did. He offered a hypothetical parallel—300,000 bushels of wheat leaving Canada, 300,000 leaving Russia, both destined for Liverpool, and when they land there the Russian would pay six cents a bushel, or \$18,000, to get his cargo into Liverpool. The only thing wrong with that statement is that it is all wrong. Does my hon. friend