

has the minister to say about the eight months of the present fiscal year? Has he examined the returns? He has gone back to a year ago; let us bring him up to date. Here is his own book, published by the Department of Trade and Commerce, under the authority of the Hon. James A. Robb, Acting Minister—acting for a gentleman who cannot be here, another of the defeated ministers! During the eight months do you know, Sir, how much butter we have shipped to Belgium? Only 5,000 pounds! The minister was bragging about that the other day. That shows how much the treaty does for agriculture! He said that last year we shipped them some hundred thousand pounds of butter. Well, this year during the eight months from the beginning of our fiscal year to November last, we shipped Belgium 5,000 pounds.

What did we do with France? There is a treaty that, as he says, was negotiated especially for the benefit of our agriculturists. The trade with France stands about this way: three years ago we sold her \$17,000,000 worth; to-day we are selling her \$11,000,000 worth. Three years ago we bought from France \$12,000,000 worth; to-day we are buying \$18,000,000 worth. That is what I predicted would happen when the treaty was brought before this House. That is what has happened. If there is any doubt about the returns, I wish to present the figures to the House for the twelve months ending December, 1925, with comparative figures for the twelve months ending December, 1924 and 1923 respectively. This statement also is prepared under the authority of the Hon. James A. Robb; they are his own figures. We bought from France \$18,573,000 worth this year; we sold her \$11,707,000 worth. In other words, the balance of trade was pretty nearly even when this treaty became operative, and to-day we have lost our business—just as I predicted, for the reason that the minimum duty that France puts on our goods will not allow us to ship any. That is all there is to it. Any schoolboy could have told him so, let alone a businessman. What do we sell them? Nothing but wheat and a few raw materials. Where is the boasted business in butter? Gone, not a pound to France, during the whole year. How much condensed milk have we sold them? Not one dollar in the whole year. How much in the way of cattle, meats, bacon, or any other agricultural product you like to mention? Not a dollar's worth—except \$2,000 worth of lard. That covers the whole of the business. And yet the minister says that this treaty was made in favour of our agriculturists. By the way, Belgium did not give us any advantage in butter. Under the treaty we are just

where we stood before, we do not get any advantage at all. We simply get the minimum tariff. But when my leader discussed the matter with me, I took the position that we might as well give to Belgium what we had already given to France, because we had given the whole ship to her anyway.

Now, in the course of his remarks the Minister of Finance, dealing with the butter business, said:

Mr. Robb: I have not the figures before me.

Mr. Meighen: Did it make any change?

He was speaking of the treaty.

The Minister of Finance evaded the question. He said:

Under the Belgian treaty we obtained the most favoured nation treatment.

Mr. Meighen: It made no change.

Still the minister made no reply. But the truth is we get no advantage whatever that we did not have before. He then changed the subject. He did not want to discuss this commodity any longer. He continued:

Hon. members have been loud in their statements that by our adoption of the Belgian treaty we ruined the glass industry in Canada, notwithstanding the fact that there was not a farthing's change in the tariff as it affected glass.

Now the minister is in his seat I ask him this question: Does he persist in that statement to-day, does he say there was no change in the duty on glass?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): He does? Well, let me refer to Hansard, page—

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend wishes to be correct, let him quote the customs tariff.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is quoting the minister's speech.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): I am taking the minister's own statement when the Belgian treaty was being discussed in this House. The minister told the House then that the Belgian treaty in respect to glass took a certain class the same as the French treaty by which there was a reduction of 10 per cent of the duty; he so stated in the House, as will be found on page 4209 of Hansard of July 9, 1924:

Sir Henry Drayton: Will my hon. friend give our own duty on glass?

Mr. Robb: The duty on common window, and colourless window glass is, intermediate, 12½ general, 12½; so the duty is exactly the same, but there will be 10 per cent discount under the treaty.

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend will allow me, what I wished to make clear to the House at that time, and what I wish to make clear to-day, is that the intermediate column, which