

in the past, and if difficulty arose certain things would occur. The section as now proposed reads:

In determining the fair market value for duty of goods imported into Canada, the prices of which are published or listed by the manufacturers—

—and so on. I do not think there is anything which justifies suspicion.

Hon. Mr. LEWIS: The remarks that I have to make should perhaps come at the committee stage, but they will take only a few minutes. The Minister of Labour has said that under these laws protection is given to the consumer against exploitation. From that remark, though I did not suppose he so intended it, it might be assumed that there was such a provision in the Bill now before us.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: It is in the next Bill.

Hon. Mr. LEWIS: There is no such provision in this Bill, and the provision in the Customs Tariff is no protection against exploitation under this Bill, but simply emphasizes the necessity for including in this Bill a similar provision.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

#### THIRD READING POSTPONED

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I have no amendment to offer, and if no other member of the Chamber has an amendment in view, we can well dispense with the committee stage. I make this statement because my honourable friends around me may not have noticed that we were passing over the committee stage.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: If nobody on this side of the House is anxious to discuss the Bill in Committee, it is not necessary to go into Committee.

Hon. E. D. SMITH: Honourable members, I just wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the Government on the prompt and effective manner in which it responded to the applications of the fruit growers. Nearly four years ago the fruit growers appeared before the Tariff Board. They were heard no less than four times. No new evidence was produced that affected the result, but the decision was delayed from year to year, at least three years longer than was necessary. That indicates the difference

between the action that may be taken under the dumping clause, which is prompt, and the action brought about by the Tariff Board. At last, just before the election, the Tariff Board recommended some very small additional protection to the fruit growers, which was passed. But three years had elapsed, and the fruit growers had lost thousands of dollars by reason of the fact that our markets were thrown open to the fruit produced on the other side of the line at a time when there was plenty of Canadian fruit to be put upon the market. When the present Government came into power it immediately applied a remedy that was effective and prompt, as a result of which the fruit growers procured markets that had not been available for many years. Immediately the duties were added, a demand sprang up in the Western Provinces for the fruit produced in the Niagara district, and a great many carloads of that fruit were sent forward within the next two weeks. To satisfy our Western friends, and to nail down the lies that were spread abroad in some of the towns in the West, to the effect that the price had been advanced, I can say truthfully and honestly and firmly that the price was not advanced. On the other hand, it was gradually reduced. We had a very large crop, and the selling price was fixed, as it always is, by the law of supply and demand. The price was never advanced one cent so far as I know. I have been engaged in the shipping of fruit all my life, and ship now in large quantities, and I know pretty well what all the shippers are doing, because there is constant and severe competition among them. The stories that the price was advanced were no doubt circulated by dealers who wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to make a larger profit. The shippers from the East never will advance the price on account of the duty, if they have a sufficient supply for the demand of the country.

The effective result of what the Government did shows the necessity of legislation to admit of prompt action. We had a case last year that illustrates this necessity. The duty on grapes was 2 cents a pound. Some of the wine manufacturers discovered that under the Act they could bring in grape juice at an ad valorem duty of about 27½ per cent, which was equivalent to half a cent a pound on fresh grapes. Before any action could be taken, the concentrated juice from California was brought in to an amount equivalent to 5,000 tons of grapes. The wine makers filled up their receptacles, and this year are buying at a very much reduced price, which I do not believe would have been the case had it not been that grape juice was brought in last fall.