

gradually building up their business. They have succeeded in establishing themselves well and they have been building an engine that has been giving excellent satisfaction. So far as I am aware, there has been no demand for a reduction in the tariff and no complaint regarding the price of these goods. I am quite aware that, perhaps, individuals, in view of this reduction, might say to the minister that it is a good thing from their standpoint as purchasers. But I want to point out to the committee what invariably follows in a case like this. When these three or four concerns at the coast, for instance, manufacturing these articles, are put out of business, as they will likely be as a result of this, and cease to manufacture, the firm in the United States or elsewhere, marketing their goods on a market that will be free from the competition of the home manufacturer, will raise the price and there will be no advantage to the consumer at all. Had there been some abuse of the tariff, had these local concerns been extracting some exorbitant price or not been giving satisfaction, or had there been some general complaint or suffering, there might have been an excuse. But in the twenty-five years or more that I have been acquainted with these manufacturers and with the business, I do not know of any form of complaint warranting a reduction. This is going to have a very serious effect upon these industries. The result will be throwing an additional number of men out of work and on the labour market. On the Pacific coast more than in eastern Canada we have been striving to build up and establish industries that are either directly or indirectly based upon our natural resources, and it must be clear to any fair-minded person that it takes a considerable period of time, especially where you have a sparse population, to develop such an industry. It is also clear from experience that if such an industry is stifled in its infancy or when it is comparatively small, that market receives no advantage since the importer or manufacturer in another country has the local competitor eliminated. Personally, I am exceedingly sorry that the minister has included this in his deductions. I wish the minister would state the grounds upon which this step was taken, if he can do so.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend will recollect that last year we made some concessions to the producer on the land, lumber mills, mines, and it was represented to us that we were going to put a number of industries out of business. That, however, has not been the result. Some of these industries are in just as good shape as they were before. This year it was repre-

sented to us that we should do something for the fisherman, the man who goes out and risks his life, making his living by fishing. It is not any more the desire of the government than the desire of my hon. friend to put any industry out of business, and we have taken care of that. If my hon. friend will turn to item 1048, he will note that we are giving a rebate of 50 per cent of the duty on the raw material going into the manufacture of these engines, so that we believe the industry will be in a pretty good position even with the change.

Mr. COOTE: What is the rate of duty on small engines used on the farm?

Mr. KYTE: I am very sorry that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) takes the view he does with regard to the effort that the present government has made to relieve to some extent the burden which the fishermen of eastern Canada are carrying in connection with their business of fishing. When the very substantial reductions were made on mining machinery and other implements of production a year ago, it was felt that the government should have gone a little further and given the large and important element of our population who are engaged in fishing some slight advantage in the same direction. I am glad to know that the representations which were made by representatives of the Maritime provinces, and also by representatives of fishing constituencies on the Pacific coast to the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) have borne fruit and that this substantial reduction has been made in the duty on gasoline engines. At the present time no fisherman can hope to carry on successfully the business in which he is engaged unless his boat is equipped with a gasoline engine. The time was when fishing boats were propelled by sails or oars, but that time has passed away. Boats are more expensive now than they were thirty or forty years ago. It costs more to build a boat in which a gasoline engine is installed than it did to build the boat that was propelled by sails. These considerations should have weight with the Acting Minister of Finance and they have had weight. There is no feature of the budget and no reduction in the duties bearing upon implements of production included in the budget proposals as brought down by the Acting Minister of Finance that will be more appreciated by the people of the Maritime provinces than the item under discussion at this moment. I should have been glad if the minister could have removed the duty entirely from gasoline engines. Not having been able to do that, he has taken