

That pretty well represented the feeling of the mixed farmers in the valleys of British Columbia, and evidently Farm and Home must have had a change of heart. Something happened. Possibly it was the Prime Minister's speech at Vancouver not long before the election in which he dwelt on the good points of the Australian agreement in the hearing of those people interested in pulp and paper work at the coast. He ridiculed the idea that butter coming from Australasia all those thousands of miles could possibly be a detriment to this great butter exporting country. I suppose the first thought that occurred to the people was that a commodity coming those thousands of miles would meet with difficulties in the matter of freight rates. But the Prime Minister did not draw attention to the fact that butter from Australia reaches Vancouver at just about the same figure as it costs to bring it from Calgary.

Anyway, whether that was the reason or not, a week before the election the same paper came out with an editorial of a very different tone:

A general election campaign is in progress and on Thursday, October 29, the citizens of Canada will express themselves and give voice and power to their opinions by means of the ballot. Boiled down to the facts, the issues are not difficult to understand, although every effort is being made to confuse them in the minds of the electors and the red herrings being utilised are numerous. The present Liberal administration under the leadership of Right Hon. Mackenzie King asks for a definite mandate on his policy, not feeling justified in proceeding for another year without an expression of public opinion on it.

Then it proceeds to outline the six points of that policy, the sixth of which is:

An increase in markets for the farm and other products of Canada by further trade treaties such as those recently made with Australia and other British dominions.

This goes to show that the paper has had some tangible reason given to it for altering its views, and I may observe that its distribution is not as great in the farms of British Columbia now as it was previously. I think I know perfectly well what the opinion of the people whom I represent is with regard to the effect of the treaty on the dairy industry. I can of course speak only for the people in the valleys in Yale, but the British Columbia Dairymen's Association, whose delegates come from every dairy section of British Columbia, from the Windermere valley on the east to Cariboo and Chilcotin on the north to the line and to the Pacific ocean, met in annual convention in New Westminster and voiced their views in the following resolution:

Resolved that whereas at the close of its last session the federal parliament rushed through legislation giving to Australia a preferential tariff on cheese and butter,

And whereas this legislation is likely to discourage the production of cream during the winter months in this country owing to the maintenance of low prices to meet the competition of Australian products moving to our ports by low ocean rates against our own high railway rates,

Be it resolved that this convention goes on record by voicing its disapproval of this concession, and that such action be taken as may be deemed necessary for the protection of our dairy industry.

As I say, we members have the honour, the duty of representing in this House the feelings of our constituents, and I have no doubt that hon. members from Saskatchewan have been expressing the opinions of their constituencies when they have pointed out that they value their principles above their cream cheques. But it is remarkable that about the same time as these hon. members were speaking there appeared in the press resolutions and reports from associations of dairymen in that province. Thus, the Saskatchewan Dairy Association at their convention—

—endorse the action of the directors in protesting to the federal government against provisions of the treaty as they applied to the supply of butter and cheese.

And at about the same time the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creameries called attention to—

—“the impending peril to the dairy interests of western Canada created by the Australian trade treaty” and declare that the company will be represented in a delegation of the Western Dairy Association shortly to wait upon the federal government in this connection.

I anticipate that when that delegation reaches Ottawa it will probably have a conference with my hon. friends from Saskatchewan, and I suggest that they could have no better topic of discussion than this question: Is it to be our habit to buy our necessaries in Canada, produced in Canada, or shall we rather tend to buy in the cheapest market, caring not whence these goods come?

I shall have no hesitation in voting for the amendment. While the government, the opposition and all patriotic people in Canada are arguing that the thing we ought to do is to increase the number of farmers, to produce more, to buy more in Canada in order to provide tonnage for the railways and so by that means endeavour to tackle the over-railroaded condition of this country, it is incongruous that at the same time the government should come forward with a trade agreement following a similar agreement, both of which have done damage to the dairy industry.

Hon. J. H. KING (East Kootenay, Minister of Public Works): I hasten, Mr. Speaker, to tender my congratulations to you on the honour which this House has done you, and although they are late still I assure you that they are none the less sincere. I also extend