

*The Address—Mr. Mackenzie King*

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The statement, as I understand, originated in this country and was cabled across as a matter of fact. Is that not so?

Mr. BENNETT: I am unable to answer that question; I do not know.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand the story originated in a Tory paper in Toronto and was cabled to the old country and spread about there, and now we are being chastised—

Mr. BENNETT: The right hon. gentleman surely is bound to give his authority for that statement. I would like to know, because I really do not know. I understood the story was carried by the Canadian Press.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have very good grounds for believing that to be true, and I understand that the Canadian Press made an apology.

Mr. BENNETT: But the Canadian Press is not a Tory paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They were quoting from a Tory paper.

Mr. BENNETT: What was the paper?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend can find the papers if he looks for them, and I will tell my hon. friend one thing for which I can vouch: I received a communication from the High Commissioner's office announcing that a sensational despatch had appeared in the London Times, sent by its correspondent from here, which was more or less upsetting the feeling in Great Britain, and they wanted to know whether or not this despatch was correct. It was a copy of something that had appeared in one of the Canadian papers here, but any one in Canada would have known—any one who had taken care to exercise careful supervision in the matter—that the report never should have been sent across to the old country. It was immediately corrected by the High Commissioner's office, and corrected in the papers in the old country. That is the kind of propaganda that does mischief in the old world.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the Tory paper?—that is what I want to know. Was it the Toronto Star?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I now pass to another subject? The next subject my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) dealt with was the question of treaties. He said France had put up her duties notwithstanding the fact that we had a treaty with France which assured us a minimum; that Germany had

[Mr. Lapointe.]

put up her duties notwithstanding the fact that we had a treaty with her, and that Italy had done the same.

Mr. BENNETT: Italy, not Germany.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But my hon. friend said Germany.

Mr. BENNETT: I said that Germany had raised its discriminating tariff, but that is not a treaty.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend brought in a reference to Germany, to the effect that we had a treaty with Germany.

Mr. BENNETT: No, a discrimination of six cents a bushel against Canadian wheat in favour of American wheat, but Italy and France had treaties.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let us dispose of Germany first. Does my hon. friend contend that there is a discriminatory rate?

Mr. BENNETT: I only know that from an inquiry I made at the Department of Finance in consequence of a newspaper article; I learned that the rate was 48.6 cents on Canadian and 42.1 cents on American wheat.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will relieve my hon. friend's mind by letting him know that that may have been the case but it is not the case at the present time.

Mr. BENNETT: When was it otherwise?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It has been changed very recently, I think. I just want to relieve my hon. friend's mind by telling him that the rate is the same at the present time. Now with regard to France and Italy, what does my hon. friend suggest? Does he suggest that because France and Italy have put up their duties against the rest of the world we should immediately begin to raise our duties? Is that the implication of his remark?

Mr. BENNETT: Any government that would make a treaty fixing specific duties in favour of any country, and leave this country with a minimum in favour of the other country, is not fit to govern.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That may be an answer in my hon. friend's mind but I do not think it is an answer to the question. When addressing the public my hon. friend is fond of drawing attention to the fact that Canada is the only country which has reduced her duties. He now brings forward the case of other countries which have increased their duties. I do not know what inference he wishes to have drawn from that fact, but I would like to direct his attention to the fact