cents per hundred kilos to $2 per hundred kilos, or almost a cent a pound, which is a very heavy duty indeed.

Just in passing I should like to refer to some newspaper reports which appeared last year, and which so far as I can judge are nothing but propaganda in favour of this government. These newspaper reports, which were sent out by the Associated Press, stated that the government had taken action and had succeeded in getting some reduction of this duty against our potatoes. Such a thing never happened; I do not know whether or not any action was taken, but certainly no results were obtained; the rate remains at $2 per hundred kilos. We are suffering severely on that account, because this offers an encouragement to the Cubans to grow their own potatoes. Instead of planting small quantities last fall they planted very large quantities and spread the planting season from the middle of October until well on in December. The result is that they will have their own potatoes all through February and March, with a later crop in April, which will shut out our potatoes. The ostensible reason for increasing this duty is of course the protection of their own farmers. That is a very laudable object, but it is generally conceded by those who know something of conditions down there that the duty was at least partly inspired as a means of retaliation against Canada for the preference given the British West Indies on sugar.

On motion of Mr. Matthews the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Robb the house adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Monday, February 27, 1928

The house met at three o'clock.

PENSIONS AND SOLDIER PROBLEMS

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

On motion of Mr. C. G. Power (Quebec South) the second report of the special committee on pensions and returned soldiers' problems was concurred in.

TARIFF ADVISORY BOARD

STENOGRAPHIC REPORTS OF EVIDENCE

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): On Friday last the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) asked that the stenographic reports of the public hearings before the tariff advisory board during the year 1927 be laid on the table, together with the general report of the chairman of that board. The various stenographic reports as received from the

[Mr. J. A. Macdonald.]

board are now tabled, save the report on cottons which was tabled on Monday, February 13, at the request of the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Adshead).

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

REVELSTOKE—GOLDEN ROAD SURVEY

Mr. ESLING:

1. Did the federal government or any department thereof, enter into any agreement with the government of British Columbia, during the year 1927, for the survey of the road between Revelstoke and Golden in British Columbia?
2. If not, has an agreement for such a survey in the present year been arranged for?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The subject is under discussion.

ABBOTSFORD, B.C. LIQUOR SEIZURE

Mr. BARBER:

1. Was a seizure made at Abbotsford, British Columbia, on November 24, 1927, of a freight car supposed to contain liquor?
2. If so, by whom?
3. To whom was it billed, and where?
4. Who was the shipper?
5. What did the car contain?
6. What quantity of liquor, if any, was found in said car?
7. If the car contained liquor, what was its final disposition?
8. Was the liquor sold, and, if so, what amount was realized?
9. What amount was due the seizing officer or officers?
10. What amount, if any, has been paid the seizing officer or officers?
11. Have customs officers at border power to seize cars containing liquor billed as another commodity, without export papers, and consigned to the United States?
12. Has inspector at Vancouver advised customs officers to keep hands off such shipments?

Mr. EULER:

1. Liquor contents seized but not the car.
2. S. J. Bates, senior customs excise examiner and G. E. Leary, customs excise examiner.
3. Shipment billed as shingles consigned to Samuel Cabot, Inc., Fort Wayne, Ind.
4. Export shipping bills not on file. No information.
5. Liquor and shingles.
6. 360 cases containing 693 proof gallons whiskey.
7. Liquor has been forfeited to the crown but not yet disposed of.
8. Answered by 7.
9. Cannot be determined until liquor disposed of.
10. Nil.
11. Yes.
12. No.