

at the prices they obtain for their butter. I challenge the hon. member for Compton to repeat that statement in his county. I think it would rather have been his duty to tour his county, after the last session, and apprise his people of the work done by his government to improve the condition of the farming class and also the help which he himself had rendered to safeguard the interests of the farmers of his county. I know that the hon. member for Compton prefers travelling about the country and be the torch bearer and acolyte of ministers, in the county of Maisonneuve, for instance, where he went to uphold the Conservative policy. I think the duty of a member is to travel through his county, as I did last summer, so as to meet the people and give an account of his stewardship.

The duty of a member is not only to draw his indemnity but to be the spokesman of those who returned him. He, therefore, must render an account of his activities, of what the government has accomplished, especially after such promises as were made throughout the country by the member for Compton and other members opposite.

Referring to the newspaper just mentioned, I find that the hon. Minister of Marine stated that he had \$758,000 appropriated for work in the county of Three Rivers—\$58,000 for the retaining wall at Shawinigan Falls and \$700,000 for the further development of the Three Rivers harbour. I shall this week put some questions to the government in order to find out whether the promises made to Three Rivers have been fulfilled. I think that since the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bourgeois) has taken his seat in the house, the only speech he has delivered was when he moved the address in reply to the speech from the throne. It is his duty to inform us, today, whether all the pledges the government made, in the course of the election, have been fulfilled. I also notice in that newspaper a photograph of the Right Hon. Mr. Bennett, represented with his arms outstretched saying: "My tariff protects industry," further on an appeal is made to business men:

We, in industry, are reaping the aftermath of the general crisis.

There should be no question of politics in the present election. Our business and interests should be the first considered. We shall discuss politics when business improves.

On the same page I read the following headline:

We shall discuss politics in four years; for the moment vote for Bourgeois and the government.

In both the Three Rivers and South Huron election the Conservatives preferred not to discuss politics, and contended that unemployment could not be looked upon as a political question.

Was it not their battle horse, in 1930? The government assumed power under misrepresentations and the people are waiting for the Prime Minister, his lieutenants and other members, just as the United States are waiting for the coming election to give their verdict. I know that Mr. Hoover has the support of the financial interests in the United States, just as our Prime Minister has in Canada, but Mr. Roosevelt has the advantage of having the people behind him to the same degree as the Liberal party has in this country.

I regret that the hon. member for Compton is just taking his seat when I am about to close my remarks, however, I must make way for the hon. member for St. Denis (Mr. Denis) who wishes to be heard before the adjournment of the house. I may say that I entirely approve the policy of the right hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), for when I became a candidate in my county, I pledged myself to support him, and I am keeping my promise.

Mr. ARTHUR DENIS (St. Denis) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, within the last few days, we note that the government feels the necessity of defending its policy, so numerous and well directed are the attacks of the opposition. No one on the government side, at the outset of this debate, dared to raise his voice, only the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) had spoken. In his pride, he imagined, no doubt, that the opposition would be disarmed after listening to his statement, however, the contrary has happened. His appeal to the patriotism and loyalty of the opposition sounded insincere and he should have known that the opposition guided and lead by such a wise chief as the right hon. Mackenzie King would not be ensnared by these vain appeals, which are always the arguments of those who have a poor cause to defend. But the Prime Minister was bolder, he even went as far as to distort the meaning of the words which our great leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, uttered at the Colonial Conference, in 1902, so as to make them serve his purpose. I would never have thought that a Prime Minister could make use of such unscrupulous means to force upon us a treaty so contrary to the interests of his country.

I read and scrutinized the agreements that the right hon. Prime Minister has submitted to the approval of the house, and, after serious consideration, I wonder how he can rea-