

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the commission recommends a higher duty on basic iron and steel, will the hon. member support it?

Mr. BOTHWELL: It may be necessary to have lower duties instead of higher.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to answer whether he will be prepared to support them if the report is in favour of higher duties?

Mr. BOTHWELL: I think I will answer my right hon. friend when I have seen the report made by the commission. Now so far as "disappointments" No. 1 and No. 4 are concerned, they can be dealt with in a general way together. They both refer, to some extent, to the same subject.

The other night the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) spent some time in quoting figures in connection with the iron and steel industry and endeavoured to show that we are importing a tremendous amount of goods that we should produce at home. From the manner in which he quoted these statistics he left the impression on the House that in the year 1925 we had imported a good deal more of these particular commodities than in any previous year which he mentioned. Now, I read from the same document that the hon. member for East Algoma quoted from. This is the summary of the trade of Canada for the twelve months' periods ending December 1923, 1924 and 1925. I am taking the figures in the order in which he gave them. He gave the figures for the year 1925, and started with plate glass. Our imports of plate glass in 1925 were just as he stated. The figures are:

Year	Importation	Amount
1923	Plate glass	\$4,274,509
1924	Plate glass	3,318,790
1925	Plate glass	3,990,613

The next item was hats and caps. We did increase our importations there a little between 1923 and 1925—from \$2,899,627 to \$2,951,753. Then in boots and shoes we increased our importations from \$1,472,407 in 1923 to \$1,670,054 in 1925. Then pigs, ingots, and so on—coming down to our iron—we imported \$2,450,605 worth in 1923 and \$1,551,783 in 1925. Rolling mill products, 1923, \$50,866,319; 1925, \$38,006,810. Then tubes, pipes and fittings, a reduction from \$4,146,738 to \$3,142,701. Then in wires there was a reduction from \$4,061,777 in 1923 to \$2,648,403 in 1925. I might go through all these items which the hon. member mentioned. The figures are given on page 4 of the publication from which my hon. friend read, I refer only to those I have cited in order to show that while the hon. member endeavoured to convince us

that our importations were increasing tremendously from year to year, the fact is that the importation of the particular commodities which he mentioned has been decreasing from year to year. Now that does not appear as if the reduction in the tariff has had the effect of ruining the iron and steel industry, or as if it were necessary for the government in its budget this year to bring in any legislation in order to meet what they call "disappointments" Nos. 1 and 4. We find the same result in the case of the importations and exportations of farm implements and other commodities, the figures in respect to which are all set out in that pamphlet prepared by the Bureau of Statistics.

Then "disappointment No. 3" was the alleged "failure to take up the matter of dealing effectively with the importation of materials produced in countries whose currency is greatly depreciated, which was dropped in a moment of weakness last session, and which is now of greater urgency than it was a year ago." In the same publication you can find what the importations were from these countries whose currency is depreciated; both imports and exports are given on page 2. The figures are as follows:

	Imports	Exports
Belgium—		
1923.. . . . .	\$5,449,962	\$13,328,248
1925.. . . . .	6,502,702	22,219,453
Germany—		
1923.. . . . .	4,962,180	13,773,291
1925.. . . . .	9,028,936	31,087,709

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): We did not have a treaty with Germany.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I am speaking in reference to "disappointment No. 3," as got out by Besco, dealing with a country with depreciated currency. If it is alleged that our trade with any country with depreciated currency has been affected by reason of a trade treaty, some one else can deal with that. The table continues:

	Imports	Exports
Russia—		
1923.. . . . .	\$338,907	\$ 132,909
1925.. . . . .	2,730	14,316,002

In respect to other foreign countries—and some of the other countries must also have depreciated currency—we find the following figures:

Other foreign countries—	Imports	Exports
1923.. . . . .	\$24,679,703	\$20,615,486
1925.. . . . .	20,777,442	28,734,025

From these figures, in connection with both imports and exports, it does not appear that the depreciated currency of those countries has had any bad effect on the trade of Canada, or that we need any legislation to protect our-