

been scotched. Whatever action the hon. minister may be considering taking, I appeal to him as strongly as I can in the name of the fruit growers to leave absolutely no stone unturned in stopping any further possibility of nefarious action on the part of these brigands.

Mr. MURDOCK: You may be sure of that so far as this department is concerned—within our rights and authority.

Mr. STIRLING: In this connection I want to read just one of the many resolutions which reach me in the mail daily, because opinion in the west is very much stirred up on the subject of this combine. I am quoting from the Penticton Herald of April 2:

The Penticton Co-operative Growers at their annual meeting passed the following resolution:

Whereas the fruit industry in the province is at the present time in a precarious condition to the extent that it is almost impossible for the grower to recover a living over the cost of production, and

Whereas the cause of this condition has been shown by the Duncan commission to be the result of vicious and unprincipled methods used by the Nash-Mutual interests in selling British Columbia products, and

Whereas Commissioner Duncan in his findings recommended among other things that in future jobber-owned brokerage houses be made illegal,

Therefore be it resolved that the Penticton Co-operative Growers, in annual meeting assembled, request the Dominion government to prosecute the Nash-Mutual interests with the purpose of securing restitution of moneys unlawfully deducted, and that the necessary steps be taken by the government to have the Dominion parliament at its present session enact legislation declaring jobber-brokerage houses to be illegal, and bringing into effect other recommendations made by Commissioner Duncan in the interests of producers.

I want to pass from that to a consideration of the dumping situation. The principle of protecting a country's products from the dumping into it of similar products from another country has been adopted in many parts of the world. Australia has it; New Zealand has it; South Africa has it; the United States has it, in a very violent form. Under the 1922 tariff act of the United States, if it can be shown to the president that importations are being made which may injure an American industry, the president may declare a duty; he may even forbid entry until an investigation has been made. The United States use that dumping clause. We read in the Ottawa Journal of March 28, the following despatch from Washington:

Anti-dumping provisions of the Tariff act were applied to-day by the treasury against the importation of pig iron from the province of Ontario.

They have no compunction about using it. Eighteen years ago—under the 1907 act—Canada adopted the well known anti-dumping clause. That clause has never been repealed nor amended. I want to touch

[Mr. Stirling.]

on this matter shortly, because I am quite sure that there is a great deal of misunderstanding throughout the country, and even possibly in the minds of some hon. members of this House, with regard to the anti-dumping situation. The one and only dumping clause in the act respecting the Customs Tariff provided that a duty could be charged amounting to the difference between the actual selling price and the fair market value with this proviso:

Provided that the said special duty shall not exceed fifteen per cent ad valorem in any case.

As the years went on and the western Canada boxed fruit crop increased in size it became quite evident that that clause was being evaded. Furthermore, there were several years when on account of a glut in the American market, their fruit was being sold at slashed prices and when it entered Canada at those same prices, with the fifteen per cent restriction still on the statute book, the anti-dumping provision was perfectly useless. So as a result of representations made by the fruit growers in 1921 the previous administration amended the valuation clause in the Customs act—they did not touch the anti-dumping clause in the Customs Tariff 1907—so as to enable the Minister of Customs to pay attention to the cost of production as well as to the fair market value. That clause was a good one and was made use of in that fruit and vegetable season. A change of administration took place, and the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in his budget speech of 1922 declared the government's intention to repeal the amendment to that clause in the Customs act. It was repealed, but owing to the consternation which that action caused among the fruit growers and the representations they made to the government, a couple of months later, the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) proposed an amendment to the Customs act which introduced clause 47A. The gist of 47A is that if dumping is taking place the Minister of Customs may, if he chooses, report the matter to the Governor in Council and the Governor in Council may, if he chooses, authorize the Minister of Customs to value such goods for duty notwithstanding any other provision of the act. That did not entirely satisfy the fruit growers, but it was certainly looked upon as better than nothing. Two years ago the Minister of Customs took a trip through western Canada and I had the pleasure of accompanying him part of the time through the valleys of the interior of British Columbia. He saw the conditions for himself; he appeared to appreciate the situation, and the fruit growers felt