

rapidly coming to the front as a dairy country. In 1911 that republic exported only 3,000,000 pounds of butter and just 1,140 pounds of cheese. Eleven years later, in 1922, it exported 53,864,000 pounds of butter and 14,798,403 pounds of cheese. The Argentine republic has gone to considerable trouble to obtain at the very highest salaries the very best cheese and butter experts in the world. They have gone to Australia and New Zealand and captured the best men there by offering inviting salaries. The republic apparently is not affected by the American duty of 8 cents per pound on butter, as is evident from the fact that whereas in 1922 it exported to the United States only 257,000 pounds, it exported in 1923 2,323,000 pounds. Why are they not affected by that 8 cents per pound duty imposed in the United States? The reason is that they are under favourable conditions which enable them to produce butter and cheese at a very much lower cost than it is possible for us to manufacture in this country. The same of course is true of Australia and New Zealand; the cost of production in those countries is very much lower than it is in Canada. Their cattle can graze the year round and they have not much capital expenditure in the way of barns and stables; nor do they pay what we have to pay in the matter of wages.

The hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) does not seem to think that a duty is of any use at all, in that it does not enhance the price of the farmer's products. At least that is what I understood the hon. gentleman's position to be. Well, if he is right in his reasoning in that regard, that if we place a duty of 8 or 10 cents per pound on butter the effect is not to increase the price of his commodity to our Canadian producer, how does he contend that a duty or tariff on machinery increases the price of the manufactured article and has the effect of robbing the people? The rule should work both ways. It is, I know, frequently argued that the price of an article is increased by the amount of the duty imposed, but that is not economically sound. That is not the case except in respect of things that we do not produce here at all. If you put on a duty of 5 or 10 cents per pound on tea I can understand that the price of that commodity would be raised by that amount or approximately that amount, but that is not the case when you apply a duty to an article which is produced in this country. Then the law of supply and demand comes into play and the price is not raised to the full amount of the duty; it depends upon the supply available in the home market at the time.

I protest against this arrangement for the reason I shall state. It is perfectly true that in the agreement with Australia some benefits accrue to certain people in Canada; I admit that at once. I can understand that the paper men would be very much in favour of the arrangement, as would the automobile manufacturers. I do not know that we should be particularly anxious about the welfare of the automobile men—it strikes me that they have had pretty generous treatment—and I do not know but that the paper men could get along without very much help. But is it fair that the interests of our farming class, those who are engaged in our basic industry, should be sacrificed for the benefit of the paper men or the automobile men?

While we do get something for certain of our people from the Australian treaty, we get absolutely nothing from New Zealand. We give to New Zealand the same benefits as to Australia; we receive some reciprocal advantage from Australia, but none whatever from New Zealand. This is so manifestly unfair that it does not seem to me to require developing further.

But it is not merely our dairymen who are interested in this treaty. I have in my hand a resolution passed by the Vegetable Growers' Association of Ontario about the time this treaty was before the House for ratification. Allow me to place it on Hansard:

Moved by N. T. Sanderson, London No. 7, seconded by Jos. Cyr, Cyrville, that we, the Vegetable Growers Association of Ontario in convention assembled with representatives from the various Branches of the industry find it impossible to profitably compete on our own home market with the vegetable products grown under semi-tropical conditions by cheap negro, mexican and oriental labour in the south and southwestern states, the reason for this untenable condition is the unfair method of applying the tariff; the failure of the Dumping Act, to prevent dumping, and the custom of flooding our market with stale or rotten goods, with duty rescinded.

Therefore, be it resolved that we, the Ontario Vegetable Growers' Association petition the hon. the Minister of Finance through the Canadian Horticultural Council to amend the present tariff as it applies to vegetables:

We request the following tariff Schedule:

Onions 1 cent and potatoes	½ cent per pound
Cabbage..	1½ " "
Bunch carrots..	2 " "
Bunch beets..	2 " "
Celery..	3 " "
Cauliflower..	3 " "
Cucumbers..	3 " "
Brussel sprouts..	3 " "
Asparagus..	3 " "
Fresh peas..	3 " "
Fresh beans..	3 " "
Lettuce..	5 " "
Spinach..	5 " "
Radish..	5 " "
Tomatoes..	5 " "
Peppers..	5 " "
Weight of package in all cases to be included.	
Carried.	