

hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. King, Kootenay) last night made a very fair and reasonable request in my opinion, and that was that the treaty should be given a fair trial before asking for its annulment. With that I heartily agree. This treaty was negotiated with Australia and passed last year. True there is a clause in it, No. 5, which provides that by order in council any other of the British dominions may be admitted to the provisions of that treaty. Generally, as I understand it—I may be wrong—treaties are made for a period of years, but in this case no period of years is mentioned, but a statement is made that the treaty may be abrogated by giving six months' notice. Judging from that provision, it would appear to me that the whole thing was more or less of an experiment, and in my opinion the government would have been very well advised to have confined this treaty to Australia for one year before extending its provisions to the other dominions. If, at the end of that year, we found the treaty was to our advantage we could then extend it to other dominions. If we found it was not to our advantage we would have to deal only with Australia in abrogating it. However, the government saw fit, before the treaty came into operation, by order in council to extend it to New Zealand, and for this I do not hesitate to criticize them. However the deed has been done and as I wish to be reasonable I believe that Canada, as a nation having negotiated this agreement with another sister dominion, we should be fair enough to give it a trial for at least one year.

Now, while I opposed the treaty last year and while I opposed it in my campaign, I desire to make my position clear in regard to the stand I shall take on this amendment. The amendment does not ask for an abrogation of the treaty, nor do I believe we could amend it, and if this treaty should come before the House at some future time—and I think in fairness it should not be brought up for another year, I would be quite willing to deal with it on the information then before us. But, connected as it is with the Speech from the Throne, and not being able to deal intelligently with it at the present time, I feel that I cannot support the amendment now before the House.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Rosetown): I did not intend to take part in this debate, but seeing that so many things have been said which I think have given rather a wrong impression in the country, I feel that I should answer one or two allegations. There is before the House now an amendment to the motion for

[Mr. Lucas.]

an Address in reply, which is supposed to serve more than one purpose. Our friends who have moved it and who have spoken to it at some length are carrying on a campaign which is camouflaged party strategy. The amendment in the first place is supposed to put the group to which I belong in a false position before our electors, because my Conservative friends cannot gracefully accept the decision of parliament as to who is to carry on the government at the present time. The other object of the amendment, as I view it, is to persuade the agriculturists of Canada to accept the price-fixing power, or supposedly price-fixing power, for their products, so that an excuse will be had for the manufacturing and distributing combines to increase the price-fixing power which they already have. That is, for the sake of immediate gain to themselves, our workers and consumers generally are to be fleeced of their earnings and the agriculturists of their dues by having to pay enhanced prices on all the commodities which they need to purchase.

A good deal has been said regarding the Australian treaty. The Australian treaty, like all trade treaties, is a one-sided piece of legislation, and I venture to say to-day that were it possible for the farmer, and particularly the producer of butter, eggs, poultry and other things of that nature, to take advantage of the production which covers those articles now, neither the manufacturer, distributor nor politician would want the farmer to receive fair play or to obtain the protection for his products which they are now seemingly anxious to give him. The member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) is at variance entirely with all economic laws, to say the least. Were it possible to protect the farmer, the government would have to pay him an amount per pound for his product equal to the protection or price-fixing power which the trade penalties give to the manufacturer, and which is always passed on to the consumer. To give the farmer any protection this would be necessary, because all his products have found their price in the open markets of the world. Will the protectionists do this? I say no, they cannot, and if they could the circle again would soon be complete, because the price of doing anything else would be increased. Whether it was surgeon, physician, mechanic or organized labourer even that gave the farmer any service whatsoever, the cost would be passed on and the farmer would find himself very soon in the place where he started. The end would be that he would be compelled sooner or later to join in the plaintive whine that goes on in this House year after year on behalf of protection for the manufacturer, and