

the hon. member for Weyburn developed his argument, but if he is correct in saying that the duty against Great Britain is practically as high as the duty against Holland, then it would seem that these duties are not such as will divert trade from non-empire to empire countries but will simply impose additional protection for the benefit of Canadian industry. If that is so, surely we are justified in offering the severest criticism of what the government has done in this respect. If because of its protectionist mandate received in 1930 the government felt that it was its duty to give additional protection to the cocoa butter manufacturers of Canada, there was only one proper way in which to do it, and that was by means of a regular budget. In that case the rates of duty could be altered as conditions changed and as the wishes of the people of the Dominion of Canada might dictate. If the hon. member for Weyburn is right and the effect of this particular duty—doubtless there are hundreds of other articles in the same category—is not to divert trade from foreign to British sources, is not to give additional business to manufacturers or producers in other parts of the empire, but is simply a left-handed way of giving additional protection to Canadian manufacturers, a trade agreement is not the proper place for such an item. Being placed in this agreement the rate cannot be changed without a breach of our obligations in honour to the parties to the agreement.

I do not think the Minister of Finance can toss this argument off in the summary way in which he has sought to dispose of it. He read a lecture to the hon. member for Weyburn and said that he proposed to say this and say it for once and the last time. It seems to me that the argument is a very serious one and should be answered. The members of this committee are entitled to know whether this schedule is merely a subterfuge to give additional protection to Canadian manufacturers or whether it is to bring about a bona fide diversion of trade from non-empire to empire sources. If it represents a real concession to Great Britain, I for one would not go very far in arguing against it, because I realize that there must be two parties to an argument; we must make concessions in order to get concessions. I think we are getting some valuable concessions under this agreement, but if this particular item is merely a subterfuge to give additional privileges to certain producing interests in this country, the committee and the house should know.

Mr. RHODES: The hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilesley) has just done what is very frequently done in this house; he has attributed to me a statement which I did not make. He could not torture the English language in such a way as to make me say what he claims I did say. I think I should be the last person to say to the committee that I refused to say more than so and so. What I did say was that I would repeat to the hon. member for Weyburn for the last time something which I had repeated prior to the dinner recess. That is entirely different from saying that if the hon. gentleman submitted a question to me I would refuse to answer.

I want to say to the hon. gentleman that although I have not recently been in the house quite so long as he has, I have been a member for a great many years. I came into this house nearly a quarter of a century ago, and I do not propose to take any instructions from him as to the manner in which I ought to conduct myself in this house. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of exercising, as they have every right to do, their right to speak and to present their arguments. Sometimes they present those arguments in a vehement manner; sometimes they are presented, as my hon. friend has just done, in an unfair manner, but the moment an hon. member on this side replies, hon. members opposite claim they are receiving a lecture. At no time have I ever attempted to take an attitude of that kind.

Coming to the argument of my hon. friend, I would say that this increase in the intermediate and general tariffs of one cent per pound was not imposed at the instance of the Canadian manufacturers.

Mr. ILSLEY: I heard the minister say that.

Mr. RHODES: We never saw them. This was imposed as part of the agreement which we made with the mother country. The increased duty was given as a matter of preference, for that and for no other purpose.

Mr. ILSLEY: Does it give it?

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend has suggested that because we increased the duty from two to three cents per pound we have therefore increased the protection to a Canadian industry. Let me say to him that under the government which he supported the tariff was free, two and two. Did that protect, or did it not?

Mr. YOUNG: Apparently it did.

Mr. RHODES: I submit that it is only a question of degree.