

of National Defence, and to my young friend from Hants-Kings, that the reason the Conservative party opposed reciprocity was because it meant the establishment of a channel of trade that could be destroyed at the caprice of our neighbour. That is the reason. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce realizes better than most men in this house how dangerous it is to establish a channel of trade and then have your competitor destroy it without a word of warning. That was the reason we voted against the reciprocity agreement, and that is the reason we destroyed it. The reason many farmers and cattlemen in Canada were ruined was because the channel of trade thus established by them was cut off without a word of warning.

But, sir, there is something more. The other evening the Minister of Justice quoted from the report of the Economic conference, and he pointed out that at Geneva it was suggested that high tariffs were very bad and that low tariffs were much to be desired. What do I find? That one of the things stressed most strongly was that we should have long term agreements rather than short term agreements. Now the reciprocity agreement was not a treaty at all. It could be terminated by either party without a single moment's notice.

Mr. RALSTON: Was not the disloyalty cry raised by my hon. friends in regard to it?

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think the hon. gentleman is just the type of citizen who should make that observation. The person who said the agreement would make us an adjunct to the United States is the gentleman who is now Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. He made the observation that if this agreement passed Canada would become commercially an adjunct to the United States.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friends said at that time that reciprocity meant annexation and that it was a disloyal policy.

Mr. BENNETT: I say now that the gentleman who was formerly President of the United States, Mr. Champ Clark, and Mr. Underwood said that. We told the Canadian electors that if once a channel of trade were established for our cattle, our wheat, and our natural products to the United States that channel might be destroyed at somebody's whim or caprice with great resulting injury to Canadians. That is what we said and if my hon. friends opposite can get any comfort from it they are welcome.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The hon. minister must have in mind what Edward Blake said.

Mr. BENNETT: It is true that the late Edward Blake had that view, and one might, I fancy, compare his intellectual attainments and his services to the Liberal party not without disadvantage to some hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, sir, let us proceed to study further what the hon. Minister of Finance said in his speech when the tariff advisory board was set up. I have in my hand a copy of P.C. No. 530, dated 7th April, 1926, appointing the tariff advisory board and defining their duties. The board was duly set up and in the course of time began to function. I find that it has cost this country quite a considerable sum of money to maintain that board. Here is the story. First of all you have the following employees: A. M. Baird, L. H. Byles, K. Byrnes, F. M. Chapman, J. Easton, K. Easton, T. King, F. Lavoie, J. C. Leslie, D. McEvoy, H. B. McKinnon, Theo. Monty, A. Quayle, M. Northcott. These all draw salaries ranging from \$4,120 per annum down to \$4 a day: among those who are drawing \$10 a day is Mr. F. M. Chapman, who was political organizer and henchman for the chairman of the board when he was a candidate for the Liberal party in South Ontario last fall. Here is the board set up, and who comprise it? It consists of Mr. Moore, as chairman, and two other gentlemen with respect to whom nothing can be said. Who is Mr. Moore? He is a defeated Liberal candidate in Ontario. That is fact number one. A few years ago I had occasion to say in the chamber which preceded the present one something regarding the activities of Mackenzie and Mann in every legislature in this country and as to the effect upon the public life of Canada. I can only say this, that Mr. Moore was one of their chief instruments in effecting their purposes. Now let us go a step further. To-day Mr. Moore is exercising the patronage of Ontario and the government accepts his recommendations. More than that, during the last month he has been discussing with his friends what his chances of success are in Ontario at the next election. There are men in this house with whom he talked the matter over. Now let us ask ourselves whether any man in whose constituency there are industries affected by the tariff and upon which he must depend for support should be made chairman of the tariff board. Why Sir, only the other day I read in an Ontario paper, with a picture of the chairman of the board, the statement that he was about to take the