

London, that is around 15 cents a pound. If hon. members opposite dispute that statement I invite them to explain the difference. How is it that to-day there is a difference of 10 cents a pound between the Canadian and the London price? What would stop New Zealand from selling butter here at the same price as they sell it at in London if it were not for the five cent duty and clause 4 of the treaty?

The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe), speaking a little while ago said that in times of adversity Canadians called the Conservative party to power. My hon. friends opposite sneered at that. I will go further, I will say that had Canadians failed to call the Conservative party to power in 1930 Canada would be bankrupt to-day. It would be a calamity.

Mr. HOWARD: On what do you base that statement?

Mr. GOBEIL: It is all very well for my hon. friends opposite to smile, but let them explain how it could be otherwise if we still had an adverse balance of trade of \$240,000,000 a year. If this government had not had power when England went off the gold standard to stop the export of gold, would not this country be bankrupt? Although the position of Canadian dairy farmers is not too rosy, where would they be to-day if they had to sell their butter at 16 cents as they would if my hon. friends opposite were in power? Does that mean that the Canadian farmer gets enough for his butter or that he is producing at a profit? Not at all. It means, however, that on the return of normal conditions, if the farmer producing butter enjoys, as no doubt he will, the same happy conditions that he enjoys to-day, he will find himself in a favourable situation such as has never existed before in Canada, and it will be entirely attributable to the action of this government.

This is only one class of commodity; let me deal with one or two other items. Let me take for instance cattle, to which the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) referred. How would hon. members opposite explain that under such depressed conditions as we are experiencing now we had exported to England from January 1 to March 23 last 7,863 head of cattle as compared with 409 last year for the same months, and nothing when my hon. friends were in power. Since March 23 last two or three cargoes have left Canada, but on that date the number of cattle we

[Mr. Gobeil.]

shipped out was 7,863. There was another item I wanted to refer to, and if I have time I shall deal with it before I get through.

I would not want to finish these remarks without saying a few words with regard to the question of trade agreements with the United States. I listened with much interest the other day to the speech made by my hon. friend from Shelburne-Yarmouth (Mr. Ralston) and I am bound to say I had to smile at some of his remarks. He spoke, and others since then have spoken in the same way, as if it depended on this government alone to enact satisfactory trade agreements with the United States. I am not going to give the history of the negotiations between the two countries under the Liberal regime between the years 1896 and 1930. No better picture can be given of it than was given in the speech made by my right hon. leader on February 20. May I be permitted however to quote one paragraph from a speech made by Mr. Fielding in 1910, when he was Minister of Finance in the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

We had had negotiations from time to time with our American friends in relation to better trade conditions, and they had not turned out very successfully. We had, after repeated efforts, taken the ground that we should not again approach the United States with proposals for betterment of our trade relations, and that, if the matter was to be reopened again, it should be reopened, not upon the initiative of Canada, but upon the initiative of the United States. Accordingly, we declined to make any approach to the United States while the question of the French treaty was pending.

Since that date the government headed by the right hon. gentleman who is now leader of the opposition held power for nine years, and what did they do to bring about better trade relations with the United States? Nothing at all. Did they try to do anything? Hon. members opposite know that better than I, but if they did their efforts have been absolutely fruitless. I will go further and say that during those nine years the duties imposed by the Americans have been constantly increasing; they have been raised to such a point as to become absolutely prohibitive. I would quote some figures given to this house by my hon. friend from Vaudreuil-Soulanges (Mr. Thauvette), who I am sorry is not in his seat. These figures can be found at page 663 of Hansard of this session. The hon. gentleman was trying to convince the government that before the treaty for the deepening of the St. Lawrence was passed the government should see to it that better trade agreements were arrived at. If he were here I would tell him that