

favored position were totally disregarded both in the negotiation of the treaty and in the terms of its enactment; and

Whereas, this special consideration shown to certain industries exemplifies one of the worst evils of the protectionist system, which is rooted in the distribution of new privileges to the already highly privileged; and

Whereas, the policy upon which the treaty was based is one of discrimination especially against important branches of the industry of agriculture; and

Whereas, the enactment of the treaty was opposed by the U.F.A. group in the House of Commons in 1925, as a discriminatory and economically unsound measure;

Therefore be it resolved, that this convention, while reaffirming its adherence to the principle of freedom of trade, and its determination to use its influence with a view to the progressive reduction of the Canadian tariff, protests against the operation of the prevailing system in a partisan and discriminatory manner;

And further, that this convention, in virtue of the reasons enumerated above, call upon the Dominion government to denounce the treaty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the schedule which was agreed upon by the Australian government and the Canadian government through the then Minister of Finance, let me call your attention to some of the provisions of the treaty. It was necessary for both parties to the agreement to make certain reductions in their tariff duties, otherwise the treaty could not come into effect or could not be implemented. Under the terms of that treaty we in Canada confer certain privileges or reduce the duties on certain products, and if you follow the different items in the schedule it will be seen that the reductions made by Canada are made on agricultural items. Permit me to read a memorandum which I prepared upon the matter:

Under terms of treaty a tariff on fresh meats imported into Canada from Australia was reduced from 3 cents to $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound; on eggs from 2 cents to nothing; on butter from 4 cents to 1 cent; on honey from 3 cents to nothing; on tomatoes and other vegetables including corn and baked beans in cans or other airtight packages, from $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents to nothing; and there were reductions on various other commodities.

The various other commodities are agricultural commodities. My memorandum continues:

In conjunction with the treaty, and in order to give a preference to Australian raisins, the general tariff was raised from two-thirds of one cent to 3 cents, and raisins from Australia were made duty free.

In return for these changes in the Canadian tariff, the Australian tariff was reduced as follows:

Printing machinery, typewriters, cash registers, computing machines and attachments, formerly 10 per cent, now free.

Newsprint, formerly £3 per ton, now free.

Other classes of glazed and unglazed paper, formerly £3 per ton, now free.

Iron and steel tubes, including boiler tubes, etc., formerly 10 per cent, now 5 per cent.

Automobile vehicles, unassembled, formerly 10 per cent, now $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; assembled, formerly $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, now 10 per cent.

Fish, smoked or dried, reduced from $1\frac{1}{2}$ pence to 1 penny per pound.

Fish, preserved in tins, from $2\frac{1}{2}$ pence to 1 penny per pound.

Gloves, textile only, from 25 per cent to 10 per cent.

Corsets, from 45 per cent to 40 per cent.

Goloshes, rubber boots, etc., from 2 shillings to 1 shilling and ninepence per pair.

There were certain other reductions.

Those are reductions which were made in the Australian tariff while, as I stated at the beginning of the memorandum, the reductions made by Canada were practically all on agricultural products. We maintain that under those circumstances it is the grossest discrimination possible. I am free to admit that I do not believe that under ordinary circumstances we can take advantage of tariff protection in so far as agricultural products are concerned, but here is a treaty which was entered into for the purpose of securing a market for the manufacturing industries of Canada which were already highly protected. We are not temporizing with this proposition at all, we merely ask that the treaty be denounced or abrogated. We believe that we are entitled to that abrogation. As I said before, the then Minister of Finance was an avowed protectionist and when it came to the making of a treaty with Australia for the purpose of securing a market for manufactured products he was willing to take agriculture by the neck, as it were, and bestow benefits upon the industries outside of agriculture. Under those circumstances we believe that this treaty was brought into existence in an unfair manner, but that is one of the complaints which we have against protection. The industries which enjoy the greatest protection seem to be able to secure the greater benefits if any benefits are to be derived at all.

During the recess I discussed with the people in my constituency the question of trade relations, first, between the United States and Canada, and, second, between Canada and Great Britain, and I have had the opportunity of receiving their advice. When the matter of retaliatory tariffs against the United States was discussed, I must confess that my constituents did not like the idea of retaliation. Indeed they feel that retaliation will merely increase the price of the commodities they have to buy either for production or for living purposes. We recognize the fact that in regard to the prices of