

procuity pact of 1911 was that it was to continue for only one year. That is what defeated that pact, and we know what happened to the Liberal party on that occasion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the second objection raised by the opposition, and particularly by the leader of the opposition, namely, the possible increase in tariff. Hon. members who listened to the Minister of Trade and Commerce will agree that he answered fully the objections raised and gave good and sufficient reasons why a tariff is necessary so that we may enjoy a preference in empire markets. I draw the attention of hon. members opposite to the fact that in the Dunning budget of 1930, in order to give a preference to Great Britain, provision was made for an increase in the rates on thirty-eight items. I believe article 12 of the conference agreement, providing for the constitution of a tariff board, to adjust and settle any disputes in matters appertaining to the application of tariffs, will act as a safety valve. In my view this is a wise and just provision which will obviate any unnecessary misunderstandings as to tariff operation.

Up to the present time I do not believe any valid reasons or sound arguments have been put forward which would justify any hon. member in voting against the agreement. At this point I should like to refer briefly to the speeches of the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. McPhee) and the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Butcher). As I have endeavoured to point out, the first named gentleman is inconsistent, because in one breath he uses the term "magnanimous agreement" and in the next the term "iniquitous agreement." He quoted certain figures to show the exportation of wheat from Canada during the years 1930 and 1931, and to those figures I now direct the attention of the house. At page 505 of Hansard the hon. member is reported as follows:

In 1930 we exported 207,000,000 bushels, and of this quantity we sent 77,000,000 bushels to Great Britain, and 129,000,000 bushels to foreign countries.

Concerning the year 1931 the hon. member said:

We find that in that year we exported 194,000,000 bushels, of which 63,000,000 bushels went to the United Kingdom and 131,000,000 bushels to foreign countries.

Had the hon. member been fair in his argument he would have said there was a possibility under this agreement of supplying Great Britain with the 131,000,000 bushels we had shipped to foreign countries. This agreement seeks to make possible the sale of that

great amount of wheat in a sheltered market under the protection afforded by this agreement.

Then the hon. member made reference to barbed wire. In my view if there is any commodity the opposition should keep clear of, it certainly is barbed wire. I hope hon. members opposite will not forget what happened to the barbed wire industry in the year 1897. At this point I should like to make a personal reference, for which I ask the special indulgence of the house. I have no doubt the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Butcher) will bear out my statement. For many years he resided in my home town, and during that time held a responsible position in the town council. Further than that, his brother was employed for some years on what is known as the Perley farm. I am proud to say that due to the tuition he received on that farm he has since developed into one of the best farmers in the constituency from which my hon. friend comes. I venture to say that the hon. member knows my farm almost as well as I know it. On that place there are about thirty miles of barbed wire fencing. The fences consist of cedar posts with four strands of barbed wire. In other words there is one strand of wire 120 miles long. Twelve miles of that was built in the year 1896, the year the Liberal party came into power on its policy of free trade. Binder twine, barbed wire and coal oil were the three items mostly under discussion in western Canada. Before the Liberal party took office there was a high tariff against barbed wire, and it cost \$2.90 per spool of eighty rod. The remainder of the fence was built when barbed wire was placed on the free list. Under that policy within two years the price of that commodity had doubled in price, and I know whereof I speak. That is a concrete example of how free trade actually operates. Many hon. members know what happened to coal oil and binder twine.

Probably I should give another concrete example. In the year 1918 and 1919 when the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen was leader of the government, to stimulate an increased production in western Canada tractors were placed on the free list. At that time there were twenty-two concerns in Canada manufacturing tractors or parts thereof. We know what has happened. Tractors were placed on the free list with the result that today with the exception of the small machine built by Ford, there is not a single tractor concern manufacturing in Canada. That is what happened the tractor industry under a policy of free trade.