

they will be improved indirectly. My hon. friend, however, stated that the marketing act has not accomplished certain things which it was never intended to accomplish. Personally I should prefer to leave it to the judgment of the farmers themselves who have been marketing their products under schemes submitted by them in which, in the two instances I cited, approval was voted by very large majorities. In addition there are other industries that wish to reap the benefits of this legislation. Last year representations were made to the government by the newsprint people of Ontario and Quebec, to see if it would not be possible for them to come under the provisions of the marketing act. Some of our prominent citizens in positions of authority, who stated very definitely that the marketing act should not be proclaimed at all until after a federal election, now are strongly supporting it.

In connection with the newsprint application I believe both Premier Hepburn and Premier Taschereau asked the government to do everything possible to assist these men, who requested that the government see if it would not be possible to bring this industry under the provisions of the marketing act. This act has been in operation only since last August; as yet it has not been in force for a year, but without any effort on the part of the government to encourage the farmers and primary producers to make use of it their appreciation of this measure is growing to such an extent that our chief concern is to cope with the demands made upon us to investigate schemes and put them into operation. The whole purpose of this act, no matter how it may be distorted, is this: It gives the producers of the Dominion of Canada their own parliament through which they can put into effect the will of the majority of the producers.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. gentleman has repeated the story—I cannot call it an argument—that the trade of Canada has decreased because of the tariff barriers that were erected by other countries while the Liberal government was in power.

Mr. STEWART (Lethbridge): Hear, hear.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member for Lethbridge says, "Hear, hear." May I ask him why this government take as a basis of comparison, with regard to trade, not 1930, the last year of the Liberal administration, but the year 1932, which was our rock bottom year due to the ill effects of the tariff legislation introduced by this government? I should like to know why the hon. gentleman's party are not fair enough to take as

[Mr. R. Weir.]

a basis of comparison the last year of the Liberal government. They are willing only to compare themselves with themselves, and at present they are not better but only a little less bad than they were two or three years ago. It is hard for the hon. member to answer that. The fact is that in 1930 our trade was nearly three times as great as it is to-day—four times as great if one considers everything. In 1930 we had twice as much external trade and twice as much internal trade as we have to-day, and the hon. gentleman knows it. He has only to produce the official publications from the statistical branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce to learn that fact for himself.

There is another very important point. The hon. member has said that the high tariff legislation of the United States was used against Canada while the Liberal government held office. In connection with certain items I admit that that statement is true. The reason the export of cream, milk, butter and cheese was smaller in the first part of 1930 was that the farmers of New England had come to Canada to buy cattle belonging to the Canadian farmer. It was impossible for the government to prevent the farmers from selling their own cattle. The production of butter, cheese and other dairy products decreased because the farmers had been willing to sell their cattle to the United States. Further than that, every person who lives either in eastern or in western Canada knows that the duty imposed by the United States on sawn lumber came into effect after the special session of 1930 as a measure of retaliation against Canada because of the high tariffs enacted by this government at that session. I would not have raised the point had not lumber and newsprint been mentioned.

May I tell the minister some facts about the newsprint industry. The real way to settle newsprint difficulties is not that of kneeling down before the pulp magnates, but that of having a minimum wage law for men in the province of Quebec. That has been advocated by at least one member on this side of the house. Only when there is minimum wage legislation for men in the province of Quebec will the lumbermen be treated fairly by the pulp magnates. Not only that; the minister knows very well that a delegation came to interview the Prime Minister in Ottawa. An understanding about the sale of newsprint was arrived at, but it was found to be of no value because one pulp company did not agree to the terms. Therefore the