

trade. We have made a treaty with them, and heaven forbid that it should turn out anything like the other treaties. The returns I am reading from, as I said before, are published by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

The minister further read us a few testimonials from different papers and he read something to show us that everything was all right in Denmark and going fine. The minister has in his possession some petitions from the west. Unfortunately, I do not have copies of these, but I see from the Regina Leader of the 6th February that the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creameries, Limited, have sent a very strongly worded resolution, passed by their board of directors, expressing the wish that the government would rescind this treaty. The government also have in their hands a resolution and notes of minutes from another corporation out there, the Saskatchewan Dairy Association, endorsing the action of this other corporation and asking for the same thing. It would be a good idea if the minister would table those in the House so that we might see what value is placed upon this treaty by these people in the west. Of course, the minister says that the United States have a duty of eight cents per pound on butter and that it does not get them anywhere; that it does not raise the price of butter. Is that the usual free trade argument that a duty of eight cents per pound in the United States does not raise the price of butter there? I think not. My friends to my left will agree with me that any time you put a duty on an article, you are going to hit the consumer by the amount of the duty, and then some, because the fellow that produces gets something too. I think I can prove all that from the Farmers' book which I took the trouble to bring here. I think I can prove it to them right out of their own book, and yet we find the minister saying that if you put a duty on butter, you will not raise the price. My idea is to put a duty on butter and raise the price by keeping out the other stuff.

Mr. EVANS: What book is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): It is a favourite book of mine—the Farmers' platform. This was drafted by the Canadian Council of Agriculture and it was adopted by the United Farmers of Alberta, so my hon. friends are all in it—the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association and the United Farmers of Ontario. It is published by the Canadian Council of Agriculture. That is a pretty safe book.

[Mr. J. D. Chaplin.]

Mr. EVANS: May I suggest that the hon. gentleman turn to the page on the plunder of boots and shoes? He will find the principle very well set forth there.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): One at a time. I was going to answer the other one. Why did the hon. member not ask that question of the government? Why ask it of me?

Mr. EVANS: The government never challenged the statement.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): Neither did I, so far as that is concerned. I said that I could prove certain things from this book. The hon. gentleman asked about boots and shoes. I would like him to ask that question of someone on the other side of the House. I am in favour of protection on boots and shoes. How many hon. members who live by the boot and shoe industry are ready to say the same thing? How many of them have made appeals on that ground and are now afraid to admit the fact? I will now answer the question of my hon. friend.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Was my hon. friend so keen about the interests of the dairy farmers in 1923 when he voted for oleomargarine, although there was a strong recommendation from the National Dairy Council against oleomargarine?

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): If I voted for oleomargarine, I did so because I believed at that time it was in the interest of my people to have it brought into this country. It was war time. We had that measure on the statute book as a war measure. Why did this government, I will ask the hon. gentleman, keep it on the statute book for two years after they came into power? I voted on that proposition in the same way as my hon. friend's late leader, Mr. Fielding.

Mr. BOUCHARD: I mentioned just 1923. The war was over then.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): The war was over in 1923; but who kept this measure on the statute book during 1921, 1922, 1923? It was a war measure; but the Liberal government kept it going and they could not get rid of it. It was not got rid of in a frank, open manner; it was got rid of only by a subterfuge in the House, by the government chucking it over to a private member to do the work. The government were scared to take hold of the thing and do it themselves.