

did not omit to give that particular piece of information, but there was not a single word in this intimation, published on October 6, 1924, by the Department of Trade and Commerce as to what concessions generally Canada was making. We had to learn what the other side of the treaty was from New York papers, so that we never knew until we came to this House the inside of that arrangement.

The truth of the matter is that when the minister went to Australia there was agreed upon a treaty which was not the same arrangement that had been submitted to this House. They made there a treaty which was based upon the proposition that we in Canada intended to raise the general rate on all agricultural items which had been contemplated originally in the treaty. But when the gentlemen who had the treaty in hand came to this House and presented the document to their own followers and their allies, that part of the treaty was rejected. It was not supported, and I tell my hon. friends to the left now that if their ranks are decimated, if their appearance at the present time is diminutive as compared with what it was a year ago, that action of theirs in respect of that treaty is responsible for their present reduced position. And what is more, that very same treaty will cause decimation in the ranks of members on the other side of the House. The treaty will never stand so far as Canada is concerned, for it will beat any government that attempts to put it into effect. I think I hear some minister opposite asking, "Would you abrogate the treaty? What would you do with it?" Well, I would not abrogate it at all, but I would go back and re-make it upon precisely the same principles as we advocated from this side of the House and which the minister practically agreed to. I say that anyone who supports that treaty and continues to support it is bound to meet with the disapproval of the people of this country; it cannot be otherwise.

In regard to this treaty I have always admitted frankly and freely that there were some parts of the arrangements which I considered satisfactory; there is no doubt whatever about that. But I did not expect that the government, in order to make some business for a few manufacturers in Canada, would think for a moment of disrupting the whole fabric of our dairy industry. And not only the dairy industry, but the fruit and other industries in Canada are affected as well. While I am on this phase of the treaty I want to show to the House a sample of the cynicism of some members of the government and of some of their campaign supporters in this

[Mr. J. D. Chaplin.]

matter. I have in my hand here a Liberal handbook; there is no mistaking its source, for a picture of the Right Hon. Mackenzie King appears on its cover. Let me read in respect of the Australian treaty just a sentence from this handbook which bears the date September, 1925. Under the heading "dairy farming" there appears the following:

The Canadian dairy farmer is told that he needs a higher tariff to keep out Australian butter. No ill effects as yet have flowed from the Australian treaty.

Who wrote that, I should like to know? No ill effects from the Australian treaty! And that book was written in September whereas the treaty never came into effect until October 1. If ever there was a ranker piece of cynicism and hypocrisy put over on the people of any country it would be interesting to know about it. I am sure that this example cannot be beaten, and if you cannot beat it I should like you to match it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend to spend a few minutes discussing a speech made in this House a few days ago by the Minister of Finance. I am glad, indeed that he is now in his seat. At page 822 of Hansard I notice these words:

Mr. Robb: He has consistently opposed all treaties that this government has brought before parliament, notwithstanding the fact that most of the treaties we have brought in have given greater preference to the dairying industry and the agricultural industry than they have to any of the other industries of Canada.

He was looking at my leader (Mr. Meighen) when he thus expressed himself. Let us examine his statement. As far as I know the only treaties that the right hon. leader of the opposition and his followers have opposed are the French and Australian treaties. We opposed the French treaty on a certain principle. When the Netherlands treaty and the Belgian treaty were brought down we said: Well, we might as well give those people the same advantages as we have given France; we cannot be in any worse position. Belgium is even a better customer of ours than France; so are the Netherlands. If we give something to France, we should give it also to those other countries. Consequently we did not oppose those treaties.

In reference to the minister's claim as to these treaties having been in the interests of agriculture, let me briefly show what has happened in the case of the French treaty, for instance. The other day the Minister of Finance told us that during the last fiscal year we had shipped over 750,000 pounds of butter to Belgium, and that that was a considerable increase over our butter exports to that country for the previous fiscal year. That is true, and I am glad to know it. But what