

hon. gentlemen behind the government who do not seem to be taking interest in this debate, read it?

We desire respectfully to express regret that resulting from the policy of and recent trade agreements made by the present government the dairy products industry of Canada is now being subjected to most unfair and unwarrantable competition from other countries, and that the Speech from the Throne gives no indication of any remedial legislation which would remove the discrimination under which this industry suffers.

This is a very important resolution which aims at remedying the defect in the treaty. That treaty came before the House last June and it went into effect on the 1st October, 1925. When it was before the House last June, it was thoroughly discussed by members on both sides. At that time I took occasion, in connection with the treaty, to make some remarks which I do not feel I have any need to retract, and I shall read them to-day largely because in the course of those remarks the attitude of some of our Progressive friends to our left is brought out. As reported on page 4853 of unrevised Hansard of last year, I made this statement:

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Chairman, although I am not opposed to the advantage given the pulp and paper industry under this treaty, yet I do not believe it is proper that that advantage should be gained by sacrificing our agricultural interests. I think our agriculturists need just as much protection as any other branch of Canadian industry. Under this treaty they will be up against almost a free trade proposition with respect to the farm products of Australia, the import of which must result to their serious disadvantage. In that regard I do not feel that I can support this treaty, although I agree that we should do everything possible to get a market for our manufactured products. But we should also conserve our own market here in Canada particularly for the agriculturists, and especially those who are engaged in mixed farming. I am satisfied that our friends from the west who support this treaty now will find it detrimental to them when they go into mixed farming a few years hence. I should think that they ought to look a little bit into the future.

Mr. Campbell: May I point out that the three prairie provinces to-day, taking into consideration the rural population, produce more butter and cheese per head of population than all the other provinces?

Mr. Anderson: Then I will guarantee they will feel the competition coming from Australia more than the rest of Canada will, and that when the treaty comes into operation they will be sorry they voted for it.

An hon. member: We have not voted for it yet.

Mr. Anderson: Will hon. gentlemen support it?

Some hon. members: No.

What I said then is coming true to-day and the dairy industry of Canada is beginning to feel the effects of the Australian treaty. It is interesting to recall some of the statements made in this House at the time by members of the Progressive group. For instance the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans), who was then a member, made this statement:

Mr. Evans: Now, we should be doing all we can to foster primary production in this country, and

particularly in the basic industry, which is agriculture, and if this country is to prosper this must be done.

Mr. Anderson: Are we doing it by means of this treaty?

Mr. Evans: No, that is what I am saying.

This clearly indicates that the hon. member was in favour of protection for agriculture; he opposed the treaty for the simple reason that he felt that the protection which was enjoyed by the dairy industry in western Canada was being taken away by the treaty. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) also contributed a few remarks which will be found on page 4674 of Hansard:

Now, when I look out to the west I remember that the people there are great consumers of raisins—perhaps no other dried fruit is more generally used in the prairie provinces, and when I think of my own constituency and the large amount of duty they will be called upon to pay under this treaty, I feel that I will have to vote against it. It is contrary to the principles which we have always professed that tariff rates should be increased, consequently I feel as a matter of principle that I cannot support this treaty, although I do not entertain perhaps the same hostility towards it as the hon. member for Bow River, but, balancing the whole thing, I think I will be compelled to vote against the measure.

The only increase in duty brought about by that treaty was a slight one on raisins in the general tariff, and yet the hon. member for Brandon opposed the agreement on that ground. I thought I would look into the question to see what the objection amounted to and I find that the duty on raisins up to then had been two-thirds of a cent per pound. That duty was increased to 3 cents per pound in the general tariff while raisins were allowed in free from Australia. I might make the point here that the hon. member for Brandon contended that free imports of raisins from Australia would not reduce the price of that commodity inasmuch as they could not supply the market, and he argued that we should still be using California raisins, paying 3 cents per pound on them. But even with the 3 cents per pound duty, I find that we imported in 1924 38,000,000 pounds of raisins on which duty amounting to \$1,140,000 was collected. This meant 12½ cents per capita of the population or 65 cents per family of five, while if we deducted the two-thirds of a cent per pound which was on before the increase the duty would amount to 10 cents per head or 50 cents per family. Surely that is not a very great price for the constituents of the hon. member for Brandon to pay in order to maintain protection to the dairy industry of western Canada. As I have said, we imported in 1924 38,000,000 pounds odd of raisins at a cost of \$3,222,000, when we paid two-thirds of a cent per pound duty, and in 1925 we imported 44,000,000 pounds at a cost of