

With reference to pledges made to farmers by hon. members opposite, may I, sir, consign to Hansard a statement made by the hon. member for Three Rivers-St. Maurice (Mr. Bourgeois), in the course of the election last August. The hon. Postmaster General was discussing a bonus on butter, but the hon. member for Three Rivers-St. Maurice went one better than him by promising a bonus on cheese. According to "La Victoire" a newspaper published solely for the occasion, since its issue has been discontinued; our hon. friend stated.

On August 8, 1931, at Three Rivers—evidently the following are his words, since a friendly photograph of him adorns the first page—

If you will put your trust in me, and favour me with that share of influence which necessarily will result from an election under the present circumstances, I shall work with all my energy to obtain from the Dominion government a bonus on cheese made in our rural sections, thus fostering the dairy industry which forms the basis of our economic agricultural system.

May I inquire from my hon. friend who is listening, also from the hon. Postmaster General who is in the house, what has become of this famous bonus on butter and cheese?

Mr. ST-PERE (Translation): Carry out your pledges!

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): Since we are discussing the Three Rivers' election, may I refute the statement often made—I think the hon. Minister of Marine repeated it in the house, last Thursday—that the Three Rivers' election was an endorsement of the government's policy. Well, to contradict this assertion, I have but to quote the newspaper to which I have just referred and in which I see in large head lines, covering the width of two pages, the following:

We shall discuss politics in four years, for the present let us vote for Bourgeois and the government.

We must conclude, therefore, if no mention of politics was made, if the electorate was not called upon to vote on the government's policy, the people evidently could not approve of that policy. To explain these large head lines, two paragraphs follow. One appeals to the business men:

We, in business, feel the reaction of this far flung crisis. There should be no question of politics in this election. Our business and interests take precedence. We shall talk politics when business has picked up.

And just next to this paragraph the other appeals to property owners.

Property owners we are burdened with taxes—

Mr. ST-PERE (Translation): And to be sure we are aware of the fact!

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation):

—the government invites us to cooperate in carrying out works. It places unlimited amounts at our disposal. Let us not send to Ottawa an enemy of the government, but Bourgeois, the friend of ministers, he will get us our quota of the public funds. Our interests take precedence over that of politicians.

I repeat it, sir, our opponents did not discuss politics, they did not request the people to give their verdict on the policy of the government. How can they, to-day, state that the government's policy was approved by the people in the Three Rivers-St. Maurice election.

Mr. LAFLECHE (Translation): It cannot be so!

Hon. E. B. RYCKMAN (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that at this late stage in the debate I find it necessary to take part. Such would not have been my plight had I been present at the time the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth (Mr. Ralston) made his speech and proposed his amendment. Had he been interrogated across the floor of the house I venture to say he would not have made the misstatements which were made and upon which he hinged his argument. That those misstatements were grave there is no doubt, and I cannot possibly realize how the hon. member could have made them. I refer only to the tariff and currency features of his address. The Department of National Revenue was brought into this debate in no very commendable manner. I am sorry the hon. member is not in the house, because he will find himself in the unfortunate position in which I found myself.

I must say, however, that the alleged facts which he presented to the house were, in many respects, wholly wrong. I realize that in connection with tariffs he and all about him protest against the artificial barriers formed by the tariff and its ill considered increases, and suggest that it is manipulated. That is not the worst of it; he says we juggled with the currency. Page 1894 of Hansard for the present session discloses that the hon. member had before him an order in council and a survey of the facts. He states emphatically that on September 28, a date soon after England went off the gold standard, an order in council was passed providing the value for duty purposes. But he is not content with that statement. Later on in a cross-fire