

on the agriculturists, as in fact it has fallen. It falls on the fruit man, the dairyman, and the man who lives by agricultural pursuits instead of being spread all over Canada. I do not suggest that the treaty will be abrogated. Furthermore, I do not believe in regarding treaties as scraps of paper but I do say this: If we have a tariff that is adequate for the protection of our workmen, our farmers, our manufacturers, and everybody else in Canada we will be able to go to the Australians and say, "In this case we were driven into a corner by very strong interests across the seas". As in fact the government were; they met with strenuous opposition from big people in the United Kingdom; and probably the Minister of Finance was obliged to go a little further than he would have liked to go in negotiating a treaty. However, we hope the treaty may be amended in such a way that there will be no feeling against our Australian friends, and that both countries will prosper.

With respect to the admission of raisins free of duty into Canada. We were going to do them a great favour in that respect; maybe we will in the future. Last year we bought two and a half million dollars' worth of raisins in the United States for which we had to pay nearly three cents a pound more because of the duty—which may be considered a duty for revenue, and I do not object to it. But we only imported \$32,000 worth of raisins from Australia, so hon. gentlemen will see that raisins were not a very prominent factor in connection with the treaty.

Now I shall resume my seat, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose upon doing so I shall recall, as usual, a number of things I might have said but did not.

Mr. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): I think it is a happy custom which prevails that a member rising to address this House for the first time in a new parliament pays his tribute to Your Honour's impartiality, dignity and kindly courtesy. With that tribute I desire to associate myself, and I would go further and express my admiration for the perfect control which you have of the two languages, your own and the language of Britain.

I desire to address myself for a few minutes to the amendment which is before the House. I shall endeavour not to repeat the many figures and quotations which have been made by other members, but I must refer to the regret which we feel at the discrimination from which the dairy interest is at present suffering. I do not criticize the government for endeavouring to make a trade agreement, but rather for the terms which are contained

[Mr. Dickie.]

in the trade agreements which this government has made. When two nations come together to form a trade agreement there must be a spirit of give and take. There must also be a mutual desire to trade. That mutual desire between Canada and Australia has been present for some years. Negotiations have gone on with interruptions, but eventually, in the summer of 1924, a draft agreement was arrived at. That draft agreement appeared in the Canadian press. It came from United States commercial intelligence sources. In it the details of what Canada was to give and what she was to receive were described, and the country judged of it in accordance with the interests of the industries.

After the session opened last year repeated attempts were made to ascertain from the government just exactly where we stood with regard to this trade agreement. We could get no information. Industry was becoming anxious. Those portions of industry which were to benefit under the agreement did not like to go ahead with their increased work, and they became nervous lest those benefits which they expected to receive should not be as great as they anticipated, and that portion of the industry which was to do the giving was nervous lest after all it should be asked to give more. At last the Prime Minister told the right hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Meighen) that he could satisfy his curiosity by referring to Australian Hansard. When we refer to Australian Hansard we find the Minister of Trade and Commerce of the Commonwealth government had delivered a long speech referring in great detail to the items of the treaty. The part of it which referred to butter, which is at present under discussion under this amendment was as follows:

The present Canadian tariff imposes a duty on butter of three cents a pound, general.

That is of course a slip of the tongue, for three cents a pound preferential and four cents a pound general.

Under the conditions of the agreement Canada will alter her tariff to two cents a pound British preferential and five cents general, thus increasing the preference from one cent to three cents.

That at least was some gesture towards protecting a Canadian industry, and as such it was appreciated by those of us who wished to see an adequate tariff rule this country. But time went on and that was all the information that was vouchsafed to us until at last, on the 22nd of June, the agreement itself was brought before the House and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) delivered a speech in explanation of it. We found to our dismay that Canada had to do some more giving, and we were extremely surprised to