is concerned. If the duties were of no use to us, why do we say that we are making a sacrifice by giving up something useless?

Something has been said about change of principles as applied to the Liberal-Progressives. I may say that you have never yet heard any member who sits as a Liberal-Progressive advocating duty on agricultural products. We realize that so far as the farmer is concerned, protection is a snare and a delusion.

Mr. KENNEDY: Is it not true that the Liberal-Progressives have been supporting protection for other industries?

Mr. BROWN: No.

Mr. KENNEDY: Why get so excited over a few cents, then?

Mr. BROWN: If the hon member will join the consumers' league, and if he will spend some of his money to fight the principle of protection by the means which we consider most effective, he will soon find out that we are not advocates for protected industry.

Mr. KENNEDY: You will not do it in the house by vote.

Mr. BROWN: The Australian treaty was opposed on the ground that it was discriminatory because of increased duties that were levied upon products not produced in Canada but which come from Australia in considerable quantities. I have had occasion to say again and again through a number of years that I opposed the Australian treaty on the ground that it placed a burden upon the consumers of raisins and currants. There is no use attempting to get away from the position which was then taken, and that was the position taken by the hon. members who now sit there. There is this to say, however, in regard to that particular duty, that while it appeared to impose a burden upon the Canadian consumer of currants and raisins it was not in any sense a protective tariff. It was as purely a revenue tariff as it is possible for us to get.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It was giving protection to the farmers of Australia; that is what you were doing.

Mr. BROWN: Perhaps it did, but we are looking at it from the standpoint of the farmers of Canada; from that point of view it was not in any sense a protective tariff. I have been interested in looking into the question of the imports of fruits to find to what extent our fears at that time were realized. The hon, member for Vancouver Centre submitted some figures in regard to fruits. The

only figures which I have at my command are figures in regard to raisins and currants, and I wish to put them on record so that hon. members may study them at their leisure.

The imports of raisins into Canada during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1925, were as

follows:

	Pounds
United Kingdom	154,121
British South Africa	50,990
Australia	158,458
France	2,500
Greece	111,380
Spain	1,547,270
Syria	13,350
Turkey	1,151,469
United States	41,232,094

I have the following figures for the calendar year ending December 31, 1929:

	Pounds
United Kingdom	 230,925
United States	 33,176,914
Alaska	30
Australia	6,032,164
Belgium	117
British South Africa	 178,942
France	 3,039
Greece	 139,552
Spain	 513,827
Syria	605
Turkey	547,531

I have given the figures for raisins, and before making further comment I wish to give the figures as they apply to currants.

The imports of currants for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1925, are as follows:

	Pounds
United Kingdom	10,488
Australia	167,683
France	32,860
Greece	4,535,015
United States	1.137,418

For the calendar year ending December 31, 1929, we have the following figures:

	Pounds
United Kingdom	1,360
United States	167,613
Australia	3,986,513
Greece	365,873

You will remember that the purpose of the treaty was to promote trade from Australia. In what degree has that purpose been accomplished? How far have we accomplished the purpose of turning the trade in raisins and currants to Australia? You will notice that our imports of currants from Australia in 1925 were only 167,683 pounds, while in the calendar year 1929 they amounted to 3,968,513 pounds. The figures for the fiscal year 1929 are still more impressive; we imported from Australia 4,863,824 pounds. We now get almost entirely from Australia the currants that we formerly got from Greece; that may or may not be good policy. I remember when