

career and am satisfied that the affairs of Canada are in very good hands irrespective of what the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) may say. I have every confidence in the right hon. gentleman who leads this government.

I was elected in 1925; in 1926 I was defeated by a Liberal-Progressive or a Progressive-Liberal—God knows what.

An hon. MEMBER: He was a good man.

Mr. MULLINS: Yes, but he had a hyphenated name. This time, instead of suffering defeat by a majority of 1,000, I came back with a majority of nearly 2,700.

I agree that conditions in the west are not good. They are not good for the man on the land, but they are all right for the man who has live stock. I stated before on the floor of this house that the sowless, chickenless farmer is not good for the west. You must have diversified farming; you cannot have one crop only, consisting of wheat. I hear wailings from those men south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway from Swift Current to the mountains who are settled on land which should never have been taken away from the rancher. We gave way to the men who came in with the prairie schooners thinking they were going to better conditions, but what happened? The hon. member opposite, the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) brought in professors from the United States to find out if grass could be sown in order to bring back the land which had been taken from us. We left that land fertile and rich but they exploited the soil with the usual result. That district should never have been ploughed and certainly should never have been taken away from the rancher.

I have a letter here which I received from one of my constituents enclosing two photographs, which delighted me very much, showing what he is doing in regard to the feeding and raising of cattle. He says:

Every day as I gain experience I am gaining confidence in you. I think I can see from the little bit of experience I have had through North America that we can produce cattle in this western country cheaper than in any other part of the Dominion and also in the largest part of the United States, and you know the condition of producing cattle in Europe.

An hon. MEMBER: Who signed it?

Mr. MULLINS: Edward Dupont, of Binscarth.

An hon. MEMBER: Put the letter on record.

An hon. MEMBER: Go on.

[Mr. Mullins.]

Mr. MULLINS: I am glad the benches are not empty; I am glad hon. members are here so that I can talk to them.

I watched the career of the government which was in power from 1922 up until the time it was defeated in July, 1930. They were always promising to do certain things. The ex-Minister of Agriculture told us that we were going to get a reduction in freight rates from the \$20 rate down. What happened? During the whole term of office they never obtained a reduced freight rate or a reduction in any manner, shape or form.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It went down to \$15.

Mr. MULLINS: We were in office not more than sixty days when we had a \$15 rate. I was brought from Winnipeg to Ottawa—and I came irrespective of my party leanings—to give evidence before what the former Liberal government called the Petersen commission, the greatest fiasco that ever was perpetrated on the Canadian people. I came here expecting that I would be of some assistance in getting reduced freight rates for the people of western Canada. My hon. friends opposite placed the matter in the hands of a man by the name of Preston. I came all the way from Winnipeg without any remuneration, and I found a man named Symington sitting there as counsel, drawing \$20 a day expenses, in addition to a charge of so much per diem. He was the man who broadcast over the radio in western Canada a talk which contained statements which were absolutely untrue but which helped to defeat us. I wondered what was behind the scenery of that Petersen commission, and I commenced to look around. There was in England a large shipping company that was standing behind Petersen, and Petersen was not in the picture. He was not putting on any boats, but he was making a deal with a large shipping company called the Thompson line to supply ships. That was what we were receiving from my hon. friends opposite. Now hon. gentlemen opposite are asking for action, asking why we did not do anything; but what do we find? As I said before, we were not elected more than sixty days before the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) got for western Canada a \$15 rate on cattle, and before long we shall have a much lower rate than that—we shall have a \$10 rate.

The hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Mackenzie King), the leader of the opposition, took the credit for the lifting of the Canadian cattle embargo. I may say for the benefit of the house, and especially the younger members who are not conversant