

The Address—Mr. Chaplin (Lincoln)

we then gave to Belgium under that treaty, and the general column were exactly the same.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): I shall not read the minister's statement again, Mr. Speaker, but I will follow the matter a little further. I was not quite satisfied with the statement of the minister, and on page 4212 of Hansard I asked, referring to glass:

How much revenue will be lost by this treaty?

Mr. Robb: I do not anticipate that there will be any loss of revenue

Owing to the reduction of duty.

I think there will be an increased business.

Then I asked this question:

The importations of glass in boxes, according to the minister's figures, amounted to \$338,000, on which the duty is 12½ per cent less 10 per cent. At 12½ per cent the duty on that glass, if we assume the same importation, would be \$100,000. There is a loss there of 10 per cent of the duty or \$10,000.

And the minister said:

That is right.

What more explicit statement could one get? But, Mr. Speaker, if we made any argument regarding the Belgian treaty, the plea was made in respect of the glass business was never on account of the small difference in duty, although it was a matter of 10 per cent on the duty; but we never made a plea on that account; the plea we made was on account of depreciated currency, on account of what this government had done in that respect, that it had ruined that business; that is the plea we made. In that connection I want to read just a short paragraph from the Toronto Globe published at that time in respect to depreciated currency, and this is what I want the hon. members to get. The Globe in its issue of February 25, 1924, said:

It is doubtful if parliament, in making reductions in 1922 and 1923 in the duties levied on goods from Britain under the preferential tariff, considered the effect of the "invisible bounty." And what is true of the pound is true, despite departmental regulations designed to prevent it, of goods imported into Canada under invoices made out in francs, marks or lire. The "invisible bounty" in all cases gives the European exporter a marked advantage over the home industries of the countries in which he sells his product.

That was the line on which we attacked the government. It was not on account of the change in duty, which was in itself paltry, and my only object in bringing the matter up now is to show the minister that when he said there was no change in the duty, not to the extent of a farthing, he was absolutely and entirely wrong.

I have another quotation to make from the minister. On page 823 of Hansard, he said:

Hon. gentleman may say: "Why should we ship cream and milk to the United States? Why not ship [Mr. Robb.]

butter?" Had the reciprocity pact of 1911 carried—which was strenuously opposed by my right hon. friend—we would have been shipping butter instead of milk and cream.

And a little further on he said:

But when Canada rejected a proposal which would have allowed her to send butter into the markets of the United States without one cent of duty, the United States revised their tariff, put up the duty on butter, and put milk and cream on a basis where they could buy it.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard on more than one occasion my hon. friends on that side of the House hark back to the reciprocity treaty in much similar language to the minister's. I want to remind him that the people of this country fairly and squarely on that issue beat the government, and I say further to hon. gentlemen opposite that if they ever have the hardihood to try it again the people will beat them again on the same measure. Was not your cause well enough advocated in 1911? Did you not try hard enough to get it through? What was it beat you? Nothing but the common sense of the people of this country.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has asked me a fair question, and deserves an answer. He asks what beat us? It was the man who wrote Rule Britannia, and the gentlemen who were then singing Rule Britannia are to-day opposing inter-imperial trade.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): Now I want to make some comment on the minister's propaganda in the last clause of his remarks which I have just quoted. He said:

But when Canada rejected a proposal which would have allowed her to send butter into the markets of the United States without one cent of duty, the United States revised their tariff, put up the duty on butter, and put milk and cream on a basis where they could buy it.

That statement I have heard before, but that statement is not correct, and the minister knows it is absolutely without any foundation whatever; he knows better than that. He was asked the question by the right hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Meighen) from his seat, "When was the duty changed?" But he passed that by in silence, as he knows so well how to do. Now let us look at the facts; let us get down to brass tacks. At the time of the reciprocity treaty in 1911 the United States was under the Payne tariff. What happened after the reciprocity treaty was rejected? Was there a revision upwards of the United States tariff, as the minister says? I ask him now to reconsider and say whether there was a revision or not. I declare now there never was. What happened was this: As everyone knows, the Under-