

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Certainly.

Mr. LOUCKS: Mr. Dunning knew it.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The Hon. Mr. Dunning stated in Saskatchewan in reference to wheat that every market of the world had been closed against Canadian wheat with the exception of the United Kingdom. I am not accusing hon. members opposite who were in the government or supporting the government at that time of being responsible for that. I simply state the fact, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it as well as any person, that during their regime tariffs were raised by other countries, practically all large importing countries against the products of our Canadian farms to such an extent that it was impossible to export them.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: The trade returns for 1930 do not show that.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The only hope of some hon. members opposite appears to be to evade the question as soon as they leave the house and to get up and repeat over and over again the same statement, which they must know is not a statement of fact. I will give two illustrations, first the United States tariff against our cattle. During the 1929-30 session of congress the tariff was raised to three cents per pound, a prohibitive tariff under normal conditions. The effect of that increase is shown in the fact that between 1926 and 1929-30 in the neighbourhood of a quarter of a million head of live stock were shipped to the United States yearly, whereas after 1930 that export was almost entirely cut off. In 1929 more than 255,000 head of cattle, including calves, were shipped from this country to the United States. During the time hon. gentlemen opposite were in power the tariff against these cattle was raised to such an extent that the quarter of a million cattle that had been wont to find a market in the United States were turned back to this country simply because the farmers could not pay the tariff raised against them.

I will take another commodity that is of special interest to eastern Canada; I refer to dairy products. I will take one year, 1927, which is fairly typical of a number of years prior to 1930. In the year 1927, in butter, cream, cheese and milk we shipped to the United States a quantity which, if it had been manufactured into cheese alone, would have made 52,000,000 pounds of cheese. While hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, however, the tariff was raised against our dairy products to such an extent as to make it impossible for these products to enter that market to any extent, which meant that they were turned

back to this country to be added to the agricultural products already here, thus forcing down the market. There could be no other result.

All I ask is that hon. gentlemen opposite be as fair in these discussions as I know they are outside of political discussions. We welcome logical, true criticism of this government, but I say it is not a statement that even purports to give a true picture when the hon. gentleman states that these restrictions have been imposed on trade since this government came into power. The events to which I have referred took place before 1930.

In reference to the marketing act the hon. member also twisted—unwittingly, I have no doubt—the answer I made when I stated that it was not the purpose of the marketing act to find new markets. That was stated over and over again when the bill was under discussion in the house. The purpose of the act was simply to develop a more efficient system of marketing, to avoid wastage as far as possible and to bring the producers themselves closer to the marketing of their own products. In regard to any benefits that may have been derived through putting this marketing act into operation, perhaps the best answer I could give the hon. gentleman is that already we have had accepted eleven schemes under the act, some of them very wide in their range, and there are now under discussion eighteen further schemes. Without any encouragement on the part of the government the farmers and primary producers have availed themselves of the benefits which they feel lie in the marketing act. For example, a fruit export board was set up. There was a great deal of criticism in connection with that board from several sections, especially the maritime provinces, but some of those who were most critical in the earlier stages and even after it was put into operation are now among its supporters. That result was shown in a vote that was taken at a conference of fruit growers held at Kentville last fall, when the vote in favour of the apple export scheme, if my memory serves me aright, was four hundred and ninety-five to one. That was the opinion expressed through the votes of the farmers themselves. The British Columbia tree fruit growers had a scheme in effect for some time before a vote was taken, administered by a local board. After it had been in operation for a year it was put to a vote, and ninety-six per cent of the growers voted in favour of it.

It may be said, if one wishes to go outside the marketing act altogether, that for example the quality of our products under that act have not been improved, though I believe