

in this country before the people of Canada so that a child could readily understand it, and has shown that this is due to the action or the inaction of this government.

I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) that there is a certain amount of prosperity in Canada at present, but I regret to say that this prosperity has not to any great extent touched the farmer or the labouring man. This talk of prosperity reminds me of an incident which happened while I was a salesman for one of the largest implement concerns in Canada. I was sent out to see an Irishman in order to collect a past due account; I passed a pleasant hour with him and he kept me away from the subject as long as possible. Finally, I said, "Well, Pat, we have had a very pleasant visit, but money talks and if you do not pay up the firm will sue you." He said, "Mr. Sinclair, do you mean to tell me that money talks?" I said, "It sure does, Pat." Then he said, "That's funny it never has been on speaking terms with me." This wonderful prosperity about which the minister speaks is not on very good speaking terms with the farmer and the labouring man throughout Canada to-day.

Before dealing with the importation of butter into this country under the Australian treaty I wish to make a few remarks with regard to an incident which occurred in the agriculture committee a few days ago. Present at that meeting was a representative of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), and he gave us some figures which only strengthened my opposition to this treaty. He assured us that New Zealand butter did not hurt the dairy industry of Canada, and then he went on to say that the farmers in New Zealand did not need barns to protect their cattle, and that the cattle were put on grass for practically twelve months of the year, while the farmers of Canada have to stable their cattle for six months and give them high priced feed in order to meet the unfair competition from New Zealand. He also told us that the average farmer could keep from fifty to eighty cows on one hundred acres, that the land was worth from \$300 to \$700 per acre and that there were plenty of buyers who would pick up this land whenever the farmer wish to sell.

Knowing something of the dairy industry I have just figured this out roughly, and I find that eighty cows on one hundred acres, giving twelve and a half pounds of milk each milking, would average twenty-five pounds of milk per cow per day, or two thousand pounds of milk in all. With three hundred milking days, giving the cows sixty-five days'

holiday, which is a long enough holiday for any cow, that would mean six hundred thousand pounds of milk per year. I see the minister is in his seat, and I hope he will take notice of this. We were also told that the price of cheese regulated the price of butter. If we consider twelve pounds of milk to equal one pound of cheese we find that the dairy farmer in New Zealand would produce fifty thousand pounds of cheese per year; at twenty cents per pound, which is one cent less than the figure he gave us, this would mean an income of \$10,000 per year for the New Zealand farmer. If we allow the farmer \$3,000 a year for expenses we find that he has a net profit of \$7,000 per year, and I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he can find any dairy farmer in the province of Ontario making that much money on one hundred acres of land.

Properly speaking this Australian treaty should not be so designated because Australian butter is not interfering with us at all. I cannot understand the attitude of hon. members on the government side of the house who argue that shipments of New Zealand butter do not interfere with the dairy industry of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite must have received petitions from all over Canada protesting against this treaty and stating the injury it is doing to the dairy industry of Canada. Even the Minister of Agriculture, in his address, said:

There is nothing wrong with the dairy industry. See all the milk and cream we are shipping to the United States; see all the milk and cream we are using in ice cream. We may be short on butter but we are producing as much or more milk than ever.

This statement was made in face of the fact that in 1928 we had 100,000 cows less than in 1927. I fancy I see the disgusted look on the faces of those 100,000 of our best milch cows upon discovering they had to leave their good Canadian homes and go across to the United States, a disgust accentuated by the nonsense talked by the Minister of Agriculture. That is nothing, however, to the look of contentment mingled with gratitude on the faces of the 60,000 additional cows in New Zealand during the past year—which increase was brought about by the prosperous condition of the dairy industry of that country as a result of the kindness and the generosity of the Canadian government—as they wallow in New Zealand's luxurious grass, saying "We will come to your assistance, Canadian Minister of Agriculture." They came to our assistance in January, 1929, when we imported 7,660,681 pounds of butter, valued at \$2,710,988; this