

wards and forwards. However, the intention of the Minister of Finance is to be found in this resolution.

Mr. LAKE. I understand that the intention of the Minister of Finance is to put the British exporter on an equality with the American exporter. I would suggest that an easier way of doing that would be to take the duty off the packages altogether, and then increase the duty. Personally, I am opposed to any increase in the duty, but I think that the suggestion I have made is a good one—that if there is any question about the bags, take the duty off the packages altogether.

Mr. FIELDING. If we take the duty off the packages altogether, how many hon. members around him will approve of it?

Mr. CLARE. Not many.

Mr. FIELDING. He says he does not want the duty increased, so my hon. friend is not prepared to give us any advice we could accept.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is to be regretted that any objection should be made by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford). I think his objection has to do with the cost of cement, and what he says should not be allowed to go uncontradicted. I have some capital invested in cement, and I know how long it has been invested, and my investment has not yet returned me a cent. There is also a company which my hon. friend from Owen Sound (Mr. Telford) knows about, because it is located there, in which upwards of \$60,000 of stock was subscribed from Brantford, and for which those who invested their money have never got any return. There is also a cement industry in the constituency of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), and I hope he will see that it gets a protection of 10 cents a barrel. That is a protection which the cement industry badly needs. The hon. member for Portage (Mr. Crawford) says that cement can be produced for 60 cents a barrel. I would like him to tell us where he gets that information. No doubt he got it out of some prospectus of a company that was trying to sell stock. Cement has been sold by some factories at \$1.75 per barrel, and still they have not as yet paid any dividend. It would be but a small measure of justice to grant cement manufacturers a further protection of 10 cents per barrel. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) says that they can ship cement in paper bags. Is the Minister going to brand these bags or not? Many of them would not hold out during one shipment, and if a man should order one carload in paper bags he will be very careful not to order another. The bags will burst and there will be more waste than will pay for the cotton sacks. Cement is not likely to be shipped at any cheaper rate in bags a long distance, and many of the bags will be

Mr. FIELDING.

sure to burst. There ought to be a fair understanding whether or not this 10 cents is to be levied on the imported article. I contend that it should be levied. The price of cement has been cut in two in the four years since Canadians have begun to manufacture it. It used to retail at from \$3 to \$3.50 per barrel, but now you can buy it at from \$1.75 to \$2 per barrel. Surely Canadian enterprise has done much for those who use cement. It has certainly given a better quality than we ever had before because the tensile strength of Canadian cement is higher than that of the cement in any other country. We have put into the business plenty of plant and capital and have all the requisites for producing this article at a very moderate price, still last year there were imported 780,000 barrels or 7,800 cars of cement, and that in spite of the fact that we have enough factories—many of which are not running—to produce more cement than the whole country can use. This item is the best in the hon. gentleman's tariff changes, and I hope no effort will be made to have it struck out.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There ought to be a limit somewhere as to the duty on cement. While strongly in favour of a duty on that article, I am only sorry that we cannot manufacture it as cheaply as it is manufactured on the other side of the line. Cement is billed at Hamilton at \$1.55 per barrel, the duty is 43 cents and the freight 27 cents, leaving the net price to the American 85 cents. Surely our manufacturers ought to be satisfied with such a high duty and ought to be able to meet the competition from the other side. I do not think it is fair that the government should go any further than they have done in this matter. I must say that I know of other industries which need protection very much more than the cement industry.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I merely wish to say that the authority I had for making the statement I did is undoubted.

Schedule B is amended by repealing item 455 and substituting the following:

455. Settlers' effects, viz.: wearing apparel, books, usual and reasonable household furniture and other household effects; instruments and tools of trade, occupation or employment, guns, musical instruments, domestic sewing machines, typewriters, bicycles, carts, wagons and other highway vehicles, agricultural implements and live stock for the farm, not to include live stock or articles for sale, or for use as a contractor's outfit, nor vehicles nor implements moved by mechanical power, nor machinery for use in any manufacturing establishment; all the foregoing if actually owned abroad by the settler for at least six months before his removal to Canada and subject to regulations by the Minister of Customs; provided that any dutiable articles entered as settlers' effects may not be so entered unless brought by the settler on his first arrival, and