

from the Argentine republic would not be serious—not at least as serious as it would be at the present time. But that is the fact in regard to the reciprocity agreement of 1911; and while my hon. friends opposite may say what they choose in regard to that reciprocity pact, down in their hearts they do not believe it would be a good thing for Canada. If they do so believe, then they have not the courage of their convictions, or they do not believe they have the ability to present the claims of that treaty before the people of this country—one or the other. Hon. gentlemen opposite may try to console themselves by saying that it was a mistake for the people of Canada to vote as they did in 1911, but I will venture the prophecy that they will take very good care they do not make any such proposition in any future election in Canada. They have had their lesson in that regard, and it is one which they will not soon forget.

The Minister of Finance, in his remarks the other day, said that the hon. member for South Oxford was a protectionist, but that he could not give him the same credit when it was a case of the government bringing into this country articles used in dairying. I do not know what the government has done in particular along that line. Looking over the tariff schedule, I find there is still a duty of 27½ per cent on glass milk bottles and on paper bottle caps, very extensively used. There is still a duty of twenty per cent on cans used for fresh milk or cream. There is still a duty of ten per cent on milking machines and machines for testing butter fat in milk or cream. These items are still in our tariff, and if hon. gentlemen opposite are consistent in their arguments, they should move at once to strike them out and to make all these articles free. The Minister of Finance said that when it was announced on October 21 that a considerable quantity of butter was on its way from Australia and New Zealand, prices immediately dropped in the Old Country. That was his statement as reported on page 826 of Hansard. A few minutes later, as reported on page 828, he said this:

You cannot fool them—

That is, the people.

—into the belief that because butter comes in from Australia and New Zealand it is going to lower the price in Canada.

How in the world does he square those two statements? Of course, this is along the line of Liberal propaganda, Liberal talk. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been for years preaching one thing in one part of the

country and another thing in another part. They have arguments or statements on both sides of the question and you can take your choice.

Speaking in regard to eggs and butter from Australia, the hon. gentleman stated last year that bringing those products from Australia to Canada would cause a reduction in the cost of living in this country. Now he says that it is not going to have that effect at all. Last year he said that it would give us a cheaper breakfast table. Now he ridicules the idea of eggs coming from Australia or New Zealand at all. Last year he stated:

We do not claim that this treaty will be of any material advantage to agriculture.

And he further stated that they were arranging with Australia for a continual flow of butter, eggs and so forth to Canada, while we send ours to England and other markets of the world. Why should the producers of dairy and farm products in Canada be forced to send the products of their labour to England and other world markets in order to sell them, while these articles are coming in under a low tariff or no tariff at all to take the place of what is grown at home and should be used? There is no doubt that that is the effect. Last year the Minister of Finance gave an illustration of the dumping clause. He referred to there being an over-supply of butter in New York and he said that there was a drop in the market because of that over-supply. What was done? Thirty or forty carloads of butter were sent to Canada; immediately the market in New York was stabilized and the price of butter fell in markets on this side of the line. I maintain that the present tariff in Canada is and has been for years unfair to those engaged in agriculture, our basic industry; that it has been made still more unfair by the treaty with Australia, and it has been aggravated by the extension of that treaty to New Zealand. The following is a statement of the exports of butter and cheese from Australia and New Zealand and Canada during the first three months of last year:

	Australia and New Zealand	Canada
Butter	102,000,000 pounds	310,000 pounds
Cheese	57,000,000 pounds	10,000,000 pounds

These figures indicate, it seems to me, what our producers of butter particularly will be exposed to in the way of competition.

Mr. STEWART (West Edmonton): Are those the winter months in Canada?

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac-Addington): The first three months.