

number of letters, many of which are unpronounceable. I intend to spell out some of them, but I will not attempt to pronounce them, and I do not think the Minister of Justice could pronounce them. Item 0246 is d-i-e-t-h-y-s-u-l-p-h-o-n-a-d-i-m-e-t-h-y-l-m-e-t-h-a-n-e. I am told that that article is really a sleeping powder. I heard it said the other day that because chloroform was allowed to enter this country free of duty, probably the government has used some of it upon certain of the outside members in order to prevent them from doing anything in regard to this particular tariff. If they do not find the chloroform effective, I would suggest they use this, because it can be brought in by the carload and the Minister of Justice can get it for them.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Spell another one

Mr. CHAPLIN: I shall be glad to do so. This is one: m-o-n-o-m-e-t-h-y-l-p-a-r-a-m-i-d-o-c-r-e-s-o-l. This is a really good one: t-e-t-r-a-m-e-t-h-y-l-d-i-a-m-i-d-e b-e-n-z-o-p-h-e-n-o-n-e.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I wish my hon. friend would try to pronounce that.

Mr. CHAPLIN: My hon. friend might give me some help in that regard.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I wish he would pronounce the one that I give him now.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let the hon. member try it first.

Mr. CHAPLIN: T-e-t-r-a-c-h-l-o-r-o-p-h-t-h-a-l-i-c. I am satisfied for my hon. friend to have a try at pronouncing that. I could give another one that might be easier with only about fifteen letters if the minister thinks he could try to pronounce it.

As I said, there are more than 200 items padded into this list, and as regards not more than one or two did we ship 400 pounds. Just imagine that, and yet we have used more paper in printing this treaty and the customs books with these extra pages than the whole thing is worth!

A protective tariff, if properly and faithfully applied, would have the same effect if administered by a Liberal or a Conservative government. I am willing to admit that. I do not care about anything but the principle; I am not disturbed by the government taking over protection. As I said a moment ago, the very highest compliment is paid to us by their adopting something to which they have been diametrically opposed for ten years. What is worrying me is this: will they give

[Mr. Chaplin.]

it a fair trial? Are they taking it to seek to destroy it? Is it a game to fool the people? I say a game, because the government have tried more than once to do that kind of fooling. On the other hand, do they now actually believe the tariff on the items referred to will accomplish any good purpose? If it is true that it will accomplish a good purpose, why did they delay ten years to put it into effect? Will the people believe that the government has had a change of heart? Will they believe that the government has a heart at all, or is this nothing but a change to catch a few votes? Will the people believe that those who have opposed an increase in duty on butter, eggs, fruits and vegetables have now sincerely changed their minds? I think it can be demonstrated without a shadow of doubt that almost the entire cabinet and most of the members on that side of the house have, during the past few sessions, gone on record against any increase in tariff on these articles. A few weeks ago the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) argued in this way: Well, if you do put a duty on butter and eggs it will not do any good, because in a little while production will overtake consumption and you will be back where you were before. Why does he not apply that to his furniture? Instead of that he brings the other minister to his relief and gets him to raise the duty on furniture.

Mr. EULER: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The government did not raise the duty on furniture?

Mr. EULER: I am contradicting the statement made by the hon. gentleman that the Minister of Trade and Commerce induced the Minister of National Revenue to do this.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am willing to accept that statement by the minister. I am sorry to have made that remark. The fact remains that the one gentleman is the furniture man and the other is the Minister of National Revenue. The Minister of National Revenue raises the tariff upon furniture. I do not know at whose behest this was done, but he raises the duty so that more duty is collected on furniture. What for? Because it is being, so they say, dumped. I ask the minister this question: Is he going to apply the same principle to other businesses in this country?

Mr. EULER: If conditions are the same.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Conditions are the same, but none of us happens to be in the bedstead business. Some of us are in other businesses.