

moved to reduce the duty on agricultural implements very considerably? I presume my hon. friend will not think that his leader was wrong in taking that action? Furthermore, the late government, representing the party which my hon. friend supports made a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements a few years ago. Had my hon. friend been in the House at that time he would have supported that policy. Now if it was a good thing to make reductions from time to time in the duties upon the implements that are used in the agricultural industry—

Mr. LADNER: I doubt whether it was.

Mr. KYTE:—surely it cannot be a bad thing to reduce the duty upon the implements used in the development of our fishing industry?

Mr. NEILL: Perhaps, it is right that I, as representing some of the fishermen on the Pacific coast, should speak on this question. I may say that the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Stork) is at present engaged in the Ocean Freight Rates committee, otherwise I am sure he would be here to lend his views in support of the fishermen whom he represents in common with myself. When speaking in the budget debate I dwelt on this matter, and indicated the advantage that would result to the fishermen not only from the remission of this particular tax, and some remissions made on the twine used in connection with their nets, but also from the reduction in the sales tax. I do not think there is any very great danger to be apprehended of these manufacturing industries in Vancouver going out of business immediately. It is a curious fact that they are always going out of business when reductions in the duties are suggested. Nevertheless they are still here, and they pop up year after year, and session after session, with the same old wail that they are going out of business unless something is done. However, we find them still here, and still complaining that they are losing money.

Mr. LADNER: Since a reduction of duties has proved so beneficial in the opinion of my hon. friend, would he advocate the total elimination of duties in the case of all manufacturing industries?

Mr. NEILL: When I was speaking on the budget I said the hon. members of this House had spent something like sixty per cent of their time debating the everlasting question of tariff protection versus free trade, and I did not propose to be drawn into a discussion of that abstract question. I can only

[Mr. KYTE.]

deal with situations as they arise. I am now dealing with the proposed partial remission of tax on engines used in the fishing industry on the Pacific coast. The duty has not been taken off altogether. The manufacturers still have a duty, and it is such a duty that it will give them a living chance. The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) endeavours to minimize the benefit to the fishermen, and figures out by some abstract method of reasoning that the fisherman only benefits to the extent of \$3.75 a year. On the Pacific ocean—I do not know anything about the doings on the Atlantic ocean—when we buy engines we pay for them, and do not spread the payments over ten or sixteen years, and if the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Snowball) was correctly represented by the hon. member for Vancouver South, when he is supposed to have stated that the average life of a gasoline engine on one of these boats is sixteen years, I beg to differ with him. That is a mistake to my mind. They have not been in general use for sixteen years to begin with, and I know of cases where six years would be more likely to be the average life than sixteen. But that is certainly an exaggerated statement of the life of such an engine. Not only the engine itself but the parts that go with it have to be renewed from time to time.

We hear about encouraging basic industries. In the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin) we saw quite a large item running into hundreds of thousands of dollars for the encouragement of deep-sea fishing. I think some of it used to be spent for paying part of the freight on fish, in order to enable them to ship it to the centre of the continent; but here is a readier and cheaper way of encouraging deep-sea fishing on the coast, by enabling them to get tools at something nearer a reasonable price, in order to prosecute their industries. The market of the fishermen is a good deal like the wheat market of my hon. friends to my left. The product has to be sold, not perhaps in the world market, but in the market of the United States. That market governs the price at which the great bulk of the commodity has to be sold. The amount of halibut consumed in Canada is negligible compared with the amount consumed in the United States. That is where the market lies, and when the American fishermen and the Canadian fishermen go out side by side, the banks being in neutral waters, they have to compete. The American has his boat, equipment and all the material necessary without paying any duty at all. The Canadian has to pay a heavy duty and