

same butter that I have described was 47½ to 48, and in Montreal 42¼ to 42½. On January 15, only two days from the date the minister refers to, the price in New York was 44½ to 45, and in Montreal 42¼ to 42½. On January 22 the price was 44 to 44½ in New York, and 42¼ to 42½ in Montreal. On January 29 the price in New York was 46½ to 47 and in Montreal 43¼ to 43½. On February 5 the price in New York was 47½ to 48 and in Montreal 45 to 45½. More than that I took the trouble to go through the Montreal Gazette, which I understand is also an authority, to get its prices. I went through it each day for the whole month of January and I could not find one day in which the same quality of butter sold as cheaply in New York as it did in Montreal. The minister says he has given me one instance to-day. I am very glad to get it, because it will certainly be a treat to see it.

Mr. ROBB: I accept that invitation and I pass it over, and in doing so may I remark that, according to my hon. friend's own argument, the importation of Australian and New Zealand butter has increased the price of butter in Canada.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): No. I did not say anything of the kind. In reply to his assertion I will read him a statement which appears in the same Trade Bulletin, and this will show whether there is a fluctuation in price. This is taken from the Montreal Trade Bulletin of February 5, and reads:

Sales of odd small lots of western No. 1 pasteurized were made yesterday at 44 cents, to arrive, while New Zealand No. 1 pasteurized near at hand sold at 44½ and a lot for shipment—

That is for future delivery.

—of New Zealand pasteurized butter was placed at 41½ cents.

Does that look as if it were increasing the price of Canadian butter? It just depends upon whether or not there is a shipment close. There was a good sized shipment on the way. It was reducing the price because it was near at hand and ready to be delivered, and anybody who says that with a consignment of a million pounds of butter a month coming into the common market the price is going to be forced up wants to have his head read.

Mr. STEWART (West Edmonton): Your argument is that it was forced down.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): My argument is that it takes away a good profit that the people of this country should have for the manufacture of butter in an off-time of the year when it costs them more money to produce it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the working out of the French treaty I want to make a little further comparison. We had no treaty with Germany. I hope our government will not try its hand at that. Every time they have tried to make a treaty we have been a little worse off.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): Always for the same reason—the blighting hands of the government are laid upon the business of the country with disastrous results. These hon. gentlemen made a treaty with France and children really could make a better treaty. We got the worst of it in the treaty with Belgium. That was natural, because having given it to one we must give it to the other. In making the French treaty we opened the door to ten other countries and gave them the same terms. This government reduced the duty upon a long line of luxuries which could well afford to pay. They reduced the duties on those luxuries and allowed them to enter into this country, with a loss of millions of dollars of revenue, and that was all done in the interests of the poor agriculturists; the treaty was made for the farmers particularly.

I want to draw the attention of the House to the difference between our trade with Germany and our trade with France. We have no treaty with Germany. Three years ago we sold to Germany for the twelve months ending December 23, in round figures thirteen million dollars worth of commodities. We are selling them to-day without a treaty thirty-one million dollars' worth. We bought from them four million dollars' worth in 1923 and we are now purchasing nine millions, so that we have a balance of trade of over twenty-two million in our favour, whereas owing to our treaty with France to-day this is the result. We started out in 1923 with a trade balance in our favour, and now we have a trade balance against us of seven million dollars. That justifies me in saying that when this government makes a treaty the effect is like a blight on a tree.

Now we come to the Netherlands. I hope the minister will not claim anything for his treaty with that country. We made a treaty with the Netherlands, but I am afraid the blight will get there too, because they are mighty good customers. Here is the position of the Netherlands' business to-day. Three years ago we sold them eight million dollars worth, and now we are selling them twenty-two million dollars worth and this business is got practically without a treaty. We buy from them about five or six million dollars worth and we have a fine balance of