

I come to the item, compressed yeast. The government is going to force that business over to England, I suppose. At present all the imports come from the United States. The Americans have yeast offices all over this country.

Take buckwheat, and beans. Beans are made free from England. There is a duty under the general and intermediate tariffs, and it is free under the British preference. Why? So that our people can buy beans grown all over the empire to bring in against the beans grown by our own people. That is not the kind of protection that I would like to see. We allow buckwheat and barley and cornmeal to come in free. That is on the second page of the resolutions, another bunk page, and the hon. gentleman need not ask me what bunk means either.

Now I come to oatmeal. We bought from Great Britain in 1929, 438 pounds of oatmeal. Of rye in the last four years our total importations from Great Britain have mounted to 106 bushels. Of rye flour we imported none from Great Britain and these are made free of duty.

The government is also allowing wheat to come in free from Great Britain. That is another bunk proposition. Here is the situation about wheat and wheat flour. We got 75,000 barrels of flour from the United States in 1929, and from Great Britain 134 barrels. The funny thing about it is that that flour came in free from Great Britain. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, we put this on the free list! It was free before so far as Great Britain is concerned, and under a free tariff Great Britain sent us only 134 barrels against 75,000 barrels from the United States who are paying a fifty-cent tariff. If the Minister of Finance really wanted to cut off the trade from the United States and hand it over to Great Britain, he did not go the right way about it.

Let me summarize. There are 387 items in the old tariff printed in the Minister's proposals, 387 items in which no change is made in the American tariff. There is not one cent of change in them; they stand the same. There are 70 items upon which the tariff against the United States is increased, and 105 items on which the tariff against the United States is decreased. Now what is the way to get imports from a country? It is to decrease the tariff. That will bring imports. Now there are 105 items in the Minister's proposals, coming from the United States, on which there has been a decrease of tariff. My figures do not exactly agree with the minister's; I cannot make them gibe, but when we examine the items in detail we shall find out who is nearest correct.

[Mr. Chaplin.]

Mr. BEAUBIEN: It is a low tariff budget then?

Mr. CHAPLIN: No, I am not saying that at all. The claim is made by the Minister of Finance that we are putting the Americans out of business in this country, that we are sending the trade that formerly went to the United States over to England. The way to bring that about, as I said before, was to have increased the tariff against American importations, to make it sure that the trade would go to England. I know perfectly well that so far as the articles I deal in are concerned—and it is enough for a person to be acquainted with his own line of business—the minister is wrong. I know he has been wrongly informed on many of the articles. I know it from experience, I do not need anyone to tell me. And I know we will continue to trade with the United States in pretty much the same proportion as we are doing now.

Let us examine this thing a little further. If that proves to be true—and there are protected articles here, there is no doubt about that—if those articles are really protected, then Britain cannot sell them to us, so how is Britain going to increase her trade with us? If our steel mills are now well looked after so far as construction steel, ingots, and other things are concerned, how can the English mills come in here and get that trade? If these things are well protected here very few of them will be imported from Great Britain. That is what I said in the first place, that this government did not know the difference between a protective tariff and revenue tariff. I do not apply that remark to every member of the government, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) knows the difference, and so does the other minister (Mr. Malcolm) who is in the manufacturing business: but evidently they have been chloroformed, they are not in the running in respect to this tariff.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have not yet begun to get through the list of what I call, and which are, "bunk" items covered by the British preference in this tariff. There is just as much bunk in these items as there was in the French treaty that I quoted. But let me continue with these items. After wheat and wheat flour comes rice-bran. Well, we got \$62 worth in 1929, and in the nine months of the present fiscal year not a dollar. Macaroni and vermicelli have been made free; they enjoyed a 75 per hundred weight tariff before. Now, what is the object of putting these articles on the free list? We are making macaroni in this country—there are three macaroni plants in my district. Does the