

Mr. YOUNG: It was shown beyond peradventure that those assurances were not worth the paper they were written on, if they were written. They could not be depended on, and as the price of glass increased, the government removed the duty. We are being told again now that the government have received satisfactory assurances that the price will not be increased in this case, and the minister says that if it is increased the competition of Canadian producers outside the cartel will force prices down. It did not the other time. The minister also says that the distributors of glass in Canada are satisfied. They did not complain the other time because they saw what was coming and they got in their supplies beforehand to take advantage of the increased price. Article 4 of this agreement provides that if at any time Canadian producers cannot supply Great Britain with her requirements at world prices the preferential duties do not apply. Why not such an arrangement for Canada? I ask the minister what provision this government has made to protect the Canadian consumer similar to the provision which the British government has in this agreement to protect the British consumer. Has any such provision been made?

Mr. STEVENS: The answer to my hon. friend is under his nose. This article is free, and we cannot make it any more free. My hon. friend also says that Great Britain has undertaken that if certain things happen the preference will be taken off. We are taking off the duty before we start, because glass is to come in free. While we differ from the hon. member very markedly in the theories he propounds in regard to tariffs and other matters, at least we have always given him credit for being sincere and fair. But is he fair in his criticism of the Prime Minister and the government in connection with the glass episode of two years ago? What happened? Down to a certain point the hon. member set out the facts correctly, but at that point his prejudice prevented him from giving just a little bit of credit to the government for something they did. What happened? The moment it was clear—and it did not take long to make it clear—I will go farther and say the moment there was evidence the company was about to break faith, or did not intend to keep faith, the Prime Minister, who was in London at the time, was cabled by his colleagues in Canada. Immediately a cable was sent back which said, "Take that duty off." That was a very salutary action, because it showed the industries of Canada—and there are many industrialists who are prepared to

take advantage of conditions—that as far as this government is concerned they had broken faith with an undertaking, and that the government would not tolerate such action.

Whatever else my hon. friend may charge us with, whatever else he may say concerning our policies, no matter what his condemnations of our actions may be, I suggest that at least he should have the courtesy to extend credit to the Prime Minister and government when they took action promptly, expeditiously and definitely. In connection with these items I fail to understand the attitude of the hon. member. What have we done in this instance? So far as Great Britain is concerned we have taken off the duty in the glass schedule. My colleague the Minister of Finance has stated clearly,—and I am prepared to corroborate everything he has said,—that the glass industry of Great Britain is by no means tied up in a cartel. There is competition, keen competition, and there is no doubt in the minds of the British government, the British delegation or the British glass industry that this is one of the most valuable things we can give Great Britain under the treaty.

Here is an instance where we meet the views of the leader of the opposition. He has complained that we have not eliminated the duty in connection with many items, and has asked why we did not lower the rates. In this instance we have wiped them out. Could we do more? The hon. member for Weyburn has said that this is a farce and that it is of no value. But I ask him this question: Could we do any more than we have done? I think if he will reflect for a moment concerning the action of the government in connection with a Canadian industry which had received protection two years ago, and had failed to carry out its obligations, he will decide that the government acted in a most expeditious manner, and that the removal of the protection offered at that time was in the interests of Canada. He must further agree that in this instance, where we have placed glass on the free list, we have done all he could have asked us to do, no matter what his theories or ideas may be.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister has asked if they could have done more. Let us look at the three items concerning glass, to which he has just made reference. Examination will show that while there has been a small reduction in order to give Great Britain free entry, there have been considerable increases in both the general and intermediate tariffs. If we examine tariff item 318 dealing with common and colourless window

[Mr. Stevens.]