

price of newsprint has fallen, and I cannot see how the marketing act will have any beneficial effect.

We have but to look across the boundary line to see that the NRA is a complete failure, due to a decision handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States, the highest tribunal in that land, in which it is stated that the codes of the NRA are ultra vires, and that they are not binding in law. The effect of the decision has been felt in Canada. The NRA was a failure; why? Because the government of the United States thought that that great country with a population ten times greater than ours could be self-sustaining. That mistake was made by the head of this government when at the London conference in 1930 the right hon. gentleman said to Great Britain, "If you refuse to support us, Canada can be self-sustaining." This was the Canadian NRA. The hon. member has said that the marketing act has nothing to do with exports. That is the weak point in it. That particular piece of legislation will not help the farmers to sell their products abroad, despite the fact that boards are empowered to raise or to decrease the tariff. There is a delegation of powers from the House of Commons to an incompetent and irresponsible board which can raise a tariff without reference to parliament. Therefore I say the matter of tariffs is relevant to this issue because the boards created by virtue of the act have powers to decrease or to raise tariff rates.

Sir, in 1930 we had the NRA in Canada. Not only that, but the Prime Minister has stated repeatedly that we have maintained our home market. That is a false statement, because the people are eating less farm products. Why? Because those who have lost their jobs have no money to pay for those products. That is the reason—and still we have something which almost equals an NRA code, and that in a country which is ten times smaller in population than the United States. We see reports of speeches delivered by Mr. Hull, the right arm of President Wilson. He is crying for external trade, and all men of vision in the United States are doing the same thing.

Here we have a system of schemes which do not help the farmers in the sale of their products abroad. The Minister of Agriculture has repeated his former statement that the legislation will not help the farmer so far as exports are concerned. This is the life preserver offered—a life preserver with a big stone in it. The farmer will be drowned if he uses it, and that is why I protest. If the

legislation had been sensible and had it been drafted in a way to give real and practical help to the farmer, whether it had been presented by the minister or by any other hon. member of the cabinet, I should gladly and heartily have given my support. But my deep conviction is that it is bad legislation, and that is why I object to it.

Mr. LOUCKS: You are all wet when you say that, and wasting time.

Mr. POULIOT: I wonder if the wit of my hon. friend is dry. This is the kind of interjection we have when a member is endeavouring to inform the farmers so that they may not be deceived. When an hon. member does that he is greeted by the jeers of members of the calibre of the hon. member who has just interrupted. I am sorry for him.

Mr. LOUCKS: I do not want your sympathy.

Mr. POULIOT: I have compassion for him, and my compassion is still greater because I see him laughing and smiling. He does not take it seriously; he is like the Prime Minister.

Mr. LOUCKS: Who would take your talk seriously?

Mr. POULIOT: He is busy supporting the government, pro and con, despite any sensible considerations.

Mr. LOUCKS: Too bad you would not follow it.

Mr. POULIOT: He is the boatman of the Volga; he is ready to support the government blindly. I regret this because I feel sure that when the time comes his constituents will not support him blindly. They will ask him what he did in the house besides jeer at other members. They will ask him why he did not take part in the discussion of these problems which concerned them.

I regret that this legislation has done nothing to increase the exports from this country. All it has done is to prevent the increase of our external trade. I regret also that one of the champions of this legislation is a salaried man in the Department of Finance. This man acts as judge under the creditors' arrangement act. I believe he is paid \$25 per day plus expenses and he uses much of his time to write articles in praise of this legislation which he does not understand at all. This legislation is no good; it never has been any good and it will be no good in the future as a means of assistance to the farmers.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The first reference of the hon. member for Témicouata