

sumption, the reason being that a great many people who were working for the manufacturers in 1930 have been set back, because the manufacturers have not had such wide markets as they had when the Liberal government was in power. People were set back, they had less money with which to buy farm products, and therefore, even if the farmer had wonderful crops, it was useless; he could not sell his products. The prices of farm products fell and someone, either in the Department of Agriculture or outside it, had the idea of making the barriers higher so as to restrict the farmer's trade still further, not only by decreasing exports as a result of the tariff dating back to 1930, but—

Mr. LOUCKS: When you remember that ninety-eight per cent of our primary products are consumed in Canada, except wheat and cheese, what has the tariff to do with it?

Mr. POULIOT: Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough not to speak so fast and to speak more distinctly? If he will do that I shall be glad to answer him. Will he kindly repeat what he said?

Mr. LOUCKS: The question is this. When ninety-eight per cent of our primary products are consumed in Canada, except wheat and cheese—and I got my authority from the bureau of statistics—how can the hon. gentleman refer to the tariff as ruining the home market?

Mr. POULIOT: I will answer the hon. gentleman's question although I am not a farmer, but before I reply I want to tell him one thing. I remember distinctly that in his first speech, either in the session of 1930 or in the session of 1931, he made the statement that if the policies of this government were not in the interests of the country he would vote against them, and since then he has been blind enough not to see the disastrous effect of the policies of the government. It is therefore pretty hard to discuss the question with him.

Mr. LOUCKS: Answer the question.

Mr. POULIOT: Mark you, sir—

Mr. LOUCKS: You have not answered the question.

Mr. POULIOT: What I have just said is merely a preliminary observation, but I noticed that the hon. gentleman nodded when I referred to his speech and his independence in word though not in fact. But coming to his question, let me ask him to look back at Hansard of June 6, 1934. He will see there the decrease in home consumption of farm products; it is on record. But that is not

the only thing that is on record. When I asked the Minister of Agriculture several times whether he could give me some explanation of the decrease in home consumption of farm products there was no answer. Every time I asked the question he replied, "I will answer you to-morrow," and I waited patiently until he told me that the Prime Minister was too busy to look into the matter. That is the answer the hon. gentleman gave. When I mentioned that to him one day he rose from his seat and said he did not mean that exactly. I replied to him that I had quoted his words to the electors of the county of Russell in this good old province of Ontario, and had then said that if the Minister of Agriculture had told the truth they should have forced the Prime Minister to resign and if he had not told the truth the Prime Minister should have forced him to resign. That statement was received with cheers by that tremendous gathering. Well, sir, here is the answer to the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Loucks), he who says he is independent but who has been a slave since 1930. He is able only to interject silly interruptions when hon. members speak about problems which affect the farmers of this country. From time to time we hear "Quack, quack, quack" from him—no reasoning, no argument; he is just blind. I am sorry for him. Not only that, although I am not a practical farmer, I do spend my time and the best of my ability in trying to get some information in order to come to the rescue of these poor farmers who are still fooled by this marketing act legislation.

Mr. LOUCKS: Support the marketing bill; that is the answer.

Mr. POULIOT: How could the hon. gentleman explain it to his electors when he does not understand one iota of it? And when he said: "What about the sale of wheat?" was he able to answer when we asked him if he was not one of those who told the farmers not to sell their wheat in 1930, that they would get a better price? It was said throughout the prairie provinces by many members of the United Farmers of Alberta, by many members of his own party. What was the result? The result was that the pools still have their elevators full of wheat. We heard about quotas, but when it came to a practical question we heard that there were no quotas on wheat. We heard it to-day from the lips of the Prime Minister. What about his speeches made in England and all that? Now we are outside the question, but we went outside the question to meet the hon. gentleman on his own ground.