

England and to the producer in Canada; second, to stabilize the price; and third, to eliminate foreign competition by progressive limitation of foreign imports, directed mainly at Denmark. Now, Mr. Chairman, you also find in the recommendations of the commission that they hope in two years to double the production of bacon in the old land. So even if there were any advantage in this article, any "potential possibilities" as referred to by a previous speaker, for the producer of bacon in Canada, if as a result of the advocacy of the Minister of Agriculture and other hon. members the farmers of Canada go extensively into hog production, what guarantee have we that we will not entirely lose the United Kingdom market, or that a tariff will not be imposed against Canadian bacon of that kind in the old country?

I also see, in regard to the telegram read by the Minister of Trade and Commerce from the High Commissioner's office in London, that there is already in the old country a wide agitation against the increase in bacon prices. You will find organizations like the Wholesale Grocers' Association of Great Britain already protesting most vigorously against this increase. Bacon as we know is the food of the poor, and this is already being called in Great Britain a "stomach tax" upon the poor. Even if we admit that there might be some benefit for the Canadian producer, there is great danger. There are going to be electoral contests staged in Great Britain, and this cry may be used by one or the other of the parties in regard to the "stomach tax" on the poor for the alleged benefit of producers of hogs in Canada. This whole agreement is crowded with potential perils such as I have mentioned, and instead of helping the cause of empire unity it is full of menace towards that cause. I think it is a pity if we are going to raise a barrier between the ordinary consumer in the old country and the producer in Canada, although I am in favour of any fair method that can help our producers.

But I agree with the minister that there is no use discussing this now, we do not know what the old country is going to do, whether they will accept the recommendation of that commission, which I think is a very able commission, so I do not see how the house can discuss this article any more than articles 1, 2, 3 and 4. The only article we can discuss is No. 5, because there we have something definite.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to ask the minister if he acted on the suggestion made from this side of the house, that he

inquire of the British government whether their interpretation of this section is in accord with his own; the point being that the minister contends, I understand, that the British government by this section obligates itself not to put any duty on bacon coming from this dominion for five years. If that is the view also of the British government we ought to know it authoritatively.

Mr. STEVENS: The position taken is that we have the agreement before us, and as I stated last night there is no dispute or misunderstanding as far as the British government and this government are concerned on the interpretation of this clause. Certainly it would be most inadvisable that upon any query being made as to the meaning of it a cable should be sent to the British government asking a re-interpretation, when the government, as far as we are concerned, are perfectly satisfied with the interpretation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not agree with my hon. friend. If a difference of view arises in the House of Commons of Canada as to the meaning, and the minister is unable to say authoritatively that the British government interprets the section as he does, then it seems to me it is a duty which he owes to hon. members of this house and to the hog producers of this country to obtain as quickly as he can an exact statement from the British government. I believe the minister will yet regret not sending the message.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. POULIOT: Before it is carried may I make a suggestion to the government? I am very glad the Prime Minister is in his seat. Yesterday we heard that the government had guaranteed the wheat of the west. Whether it is good or whether it is bad I am not yet ready to express a view, but may I ask the government seriously to consider if it is not advisable to give the same warranty to the farmers who raise hogs, to those engaged in the dairying industry, in potato-growing, to those who have greenhouses, to those—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member must state his question.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, I will put the question with reference to the hog industry, and it will not be with regard to a possible hog industry but the actual industry.

Mr. GOTT: What about the decline in exports due to the Australian treaty?

Mr. POULIOT: I thought the hon. gentleman was an expert only in onions.