

ency. But what does this industry mean to Canada in general and to the county in particular in which the hon. member for North Essex lives? His county is benefiting to the extent of a payroll of \$4,350,000 a year; the Government of this country is benefiting in customs paid to the extent of \$696,000 a year, without including the duties paid by other corporations that supply the Ford Company with goods used in the manufacture of its car.

Now, having performed the duties of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) and of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy)—

Mr. McCOIG: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question? He has referred to the hon. member for Kent not defending the automobile business. Would it make any difference if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Chaplin) read what the hon. member for West Lambton said in relation to the automobile business? I cannot see that he criticised that business to any extent.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That may be the opinion of the hon. member (Mr. McCoig). At any rate, I do not wish to repeat the speech he refers to, but I certainly looked upon it in that light. The hon. member for West Lambton made out a suppositious case in an attempt to show that the Government was taking a tremendous tax out of the people, and that the people were getting no particular benefit in return; but I think I have shown by figures that cannot be refuted that such is not the case—that as a matter of fact the reverse holds good.

Mr. McCOIG: From your standpoint only.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Now I want to refer to a book that I have under my hand entitled "The Farmers' Platform." This book was published a year or two ago, but although its colour has not changed, the name, I understand, has, and the Farmers party is now known as the Progressive or the Agrarian party. A year or two ago the old name was good enough, but they were afraid that possibly the class call that was raised against them would be prejudicial to their prospects so they changed their name. I want to refer to several quotations in this book and I wish to do so in a kindly and gentlemanly spirit. I hope that what I shall have to say will be taken in the spirit in which it is intended; I do not want to be harsh and I will not accuse those concerned of profiteering or anything of the kind. The book in question has

[Mr. Chaplin.]

been prepared by the Canadian Council of Agriculture and adopted by the United Farmers of Alberta, the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association and the United Farmers of Ontario. It is issued by the Canadian Council of Agriculture and published by the Grain Growers' Guide, so that it is fairly well revised or edited and fairly well, I should think, recommended. The first quotation I shall make is headed, "What the tariff costs," and reads as follows:

As already explained, under a system of protection, the consumer is compelled to pay a tax upon all imported goods that come under the tariff schedule. Upon all goods of domestic origin, produced under a protective system, the consumer must likewise pay a tax—although in this case the revenue finds its way to the bank account of private individuals alone. Now it has been estimated that the domestic trade of Canada alone is at least four times as great as the country's foreign trade, and in the United States seven times as great. It follows that for every dollar collected by way of customs dues, at least \$4 are paid to private individuals. When one considers that the customs revenue for the year ending March 31, 1916, was \$133,000,000, and that four times that sum was paid in addition to the protected interests, it will be seen what a crushing weight is laid upon the country's consumers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to avoid all possibility of a mistake, but this book has been so well edited and revised and so well prepared, that I would not think it possible for a clerical error of any consequence to have crept within its covers. Consequently I am very much surprised to find that the customs revenue for the year ending March 31, 1916, is given as \$133,000,000. I now have under my hand the customs returns for that year and they amount to \$103,000,000. Of course a difference of thirty millions is only a small item, but you will notice that they say here that the figure is to be multiplied by four as being trade within the country. Thirty millions multiplied by four makes the trifling amount of \$120,000,000. I am not advancing this as an argument but merely pointing out that these gentlemen from the Northwest, these new economists who have been studying political economy and all other forms of economy, during the last year, might have paid some attention to the facts, and seen that this book was published in correct form. That would occur to me as a good thing for them to do, and I would recommend that the next time they venture upon such a publication they will see to it that it is accurate. And here I might pause to observe that although in