

of wine all over the United States. In view of that statement it is significant that we are buying raisins from the United States two cents per pound cheaper than we were buying them in 1925.

Mr. EVANS: Who gets the difference?

Mr. BROWN: I cannot explain why, but it is a fact that Australian raisins were coming in during 1925 at about twelve cents per pound, and they are still coming in at the same price. I suppose the only explanation to be offered is that they are of a superior quality, as we are buying 6,000,000 pounds instead of only about 158,000 pounds. It may not be a fair assumption to say that the United States is absorbing that duty, but in order to be fair I would like to put some figures on record. A rate of three cents per pound paid on the raisins received last year from the United States would amount to \$1,001,425.89; had the former rate of duty been imposed that total would have been \$262,005.54, leaving a balance against us of \$739,420.35.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is the bonus you paid to the Australian farmer?

Mr. BROWN: If the assumption is correct that the United States is absorbing part of that duty, it would reduce that amount by \$663,539.28, leaving a net total against us of \$75,881.07.

Mr. LUCAS: Has the hon. gentleman stated how many raisins were received from Australia?

Mr. BROWN: I have given that figure a number of times—it was 6,032,162 pounds for the calendar year 1929. I present these facts for the consideration of the house in an effort to prove that the fears expressed as to the burden being placed upon the consumer have not been realized, although there is still a considerable balance to be made up. It is quite probable that as the years go by that adverse balance will be entirely wiped out. As regards raisins, I do not desire to draw absolute conclusions from these figures; for I admit that in a measure they are based upon assumption, but in the matter of currants, I think my contention is absolutely proven, that we have accomplished the purpose of the treaty and no burden has been laid upon the consumer.

On motion of Mr. McRae the debate was adjourned.

2419—61

DIVORCE COURT FOR ONTARIO

EXPLANATIONS AS TO CASTING OF VOTES ON AMENDMENT

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I make a very brief explanation regarding the taking of the vote on the amendment to the bill regarding divorce? I was guilty of a slight deviation from the rule of silence, which guilt was shared by most members of the house, and I was carrying on a conversation with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin). We did not notice that the vote for the affirmative had not been completed, and when an hon. member to our right voted, we both rose in our seats and the teller counted us for the affirmative. It was our intention to vote in the negative, and when the negative vote was called for we voted for the negative. I must apologize to the house for my indiscretion and I ask that the vote be corrected.

Mr. BROWN: The hon. members voted "inadvertently."

Mr. STEVENS: It was not an intentional inadvertence.

Hon. J. D. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the clerk of the house that the records show that I voted both ways, when I intended only to vote against the amendment. I was not paying attention at the moment to the progress of the vote, and when the hon. gentlemen to my right voted I did likewise. I ask that my vote be recorded in the negative.

Mr. BROWN: The hon. member can sympathize with the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird).

Mr. CHAPLIN: Unfortunately the vote was not close enough to make the decision so important. Besides there is a further difference, I was not paired.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, March 26, 1930

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

First report of the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.—Mr. Young (Saskatoon) for Mr. Cahill.

Second report of the select standing committee on banking and commerce.—Mr. Hay.