

force since then. It is a most pertinent and relevant question, and I am sure the minister is able to answer it.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I am afraid the hon. member did not hear what I said before. The information he has asked for I have already put on Hansard this evening, but I will read it again if he wishes.

Mr. POULIOT: Let me summarize it. Would the minister be kind enough—we will give him time to do it—to tell the committee how many schemes, and they are not many, were approved and in force on or before December 31, 1934; and the number of schemes that applied to one province only or to all provinces.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): They are as follows: Tree fruit scheme, August 28, 1934; fruit export marketing scheme, September 8, 1934; British Columbia red cedar shingle export scheme, October 13, 1934; British Columbia dried salt herring and dried salt salmon scheme, October 22, 1934; Ontario flue cured tobacco scheme, October 26, 1934.

Mr. POULIOT: That is all? May I ask the minister the number of schemes that have been approved and in force since January 1, 1935?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): They are as follows: Milk marketing scheme, lower mainland, British Columbia, January 1, 1935; eastern Canada potato marketing scheme, January 18, 1935; western Ontario bean marketing scheme, February 1, 1935; British Columbia interior vegetable marketing scheme, March 4, 1935; British Columbia coast vegetable marketing scheme, March 4, 1935; Canada jam marketing scheme, April 10, 1935.

Mr. POULIOT: Would the minister be kind enough to give us a compilation of trade figures showing the exports of each of the products he has mentioned since the marketing act came into force, and in the compilation will he give us the figures for the corresponding months of last year or the year before, when the marketing act was not in force, in order that we may see whether there has been any development of trade due to the Marketing Act?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I have not this information available and it would require a good deal of work to compile it. But even if I did compile it I do not think it would have any bearing on this subject, because this is not a matter that has reference to the finding of new markets through trade policies. The same products have to be marketed, whether

[Mr. Pouliot.]

under the marketing act or not. As regards obtaining the information asked for, I shall be glad to get it for the hon. gentleman, though I do not think it has any bearing on the matter. It would be impossible to get it to-night.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank the minister, but I am sorry to disagree with him on that point. In the early days of January the Prime Minister broadcast speeches in which he declared that the marketing act had been a boon to the farmer. Not only did he make that statement over the radio but it was published in the newspapers. Five hundred thousand copies of his speeches were distributed throughout the country. The right hon. gentleman said that owing to the marketing act the farmers were on their way to prosperity. There were only a few schemes in force then and the minister has not the information available. I have just asked him for information in line with the speeches delivered by the Prime Minister over the radio and he says it is not available. He may have the source of that information but he has not had it tabulated; otherwise he would have it now. It is nearly six months since the Prime Minister delivered his speeches over the radio, and how could he declare to this country at that time that the marketing act had been a boon to the farmers? It was a bluff as usual. Here we have a piece of legislation which is just as rotten as every other piece of legislation which has been brought down by this government since 1930. It is a bluff. We have heard from the lips of the Minister of Agriculture that it will serve no purpose in connection with exports; it will serve no purpose in connection with increasing the home market and improving it, because tariff walls are erected within each province. It is worse than ever. It is a scheme that comes from the heads of those brain trust fellows whom we should rather call brainless. The real cause of the farmer's troubles, the real reason why he cannot sell his products, is the reason set forth by my hon. friend from Weyburn (Mr. Young) in his excellent report on price spreads. We must go back to the fundamental reason why the farmer is in difficulties; it is the fact that the consumer has lost his purchasing power owing to the nefarious policies of this government, for the reason set forth so ably by my hon. friend from Weyburn.

Mr. McPHEE: And others.

Mr. POULIOT: The tariff policy of this government is the cause of the farmer's distress; that is evident. The decrease in exports has resulted in a decrease in home con-