

so as to give them a chance to ship under the same conditions as the United States, or, in other words, to have the duty raised on our side so as to make the fight a fair one. I have already taken this matter up with the Customs department with no results up to the present time. They are investigating in order to ascertain the objections before acting. I find the furniture factories and piano manufacturers are objecting to the duty being put on, and I venture to say that there are many cases of this kind. The tariff is one of the most vital questions with which we have to deal and it cannot be studied too carefully. For that reason, I would have a commission of experts appointed to study that question and to do nothing else. The tariff must not be made a political football as it is too serious a question. There is much talk now in the opposition ranks about the old National Policy. That policy would be just as far out of date now as the old stores of fifty years ago, selling the same goods as they had in their stores at that date, and I do not think there is any more chance of its restoration than there is of the old stores selling to-day the goods they had half a century ago.

Mr. N. H. McTAGGART (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I should not desire to prolong this debate were it not for the fact that I find myself very much out of accord with the budget proposals of the government which are before us at the present time. To my mind, the present budget constitutes a definite challenge to the low tariff forces in the country that the protective principle has been definitely adopted by this government as the keynote of its tariff policy. The budget which is before us is the fourth which this government have brought down since they have come into office, and it is interesting to note what changes have been made during the last three years along the line of reductions in the tariff. In the first session of this parliament we were told that, this government being new in office, no changes in the tariff could be contemplated until after a thorough study of the schedules should be made. In the second session, beyond a few minor reductions in the tariff, we were informed that uncertainty with regard to the tariff was not good for business and that henceforth the policy of the government was to be along the line of tariff stability.

The third session there were fairly substantial reductions in the tariff, chiefly on agricultural implements, but the most notable feature of the third budget was the pronouncement accompanying it that the government policy contemplated a general reduction of

tariffs all along the line. The budget which we have before us, and the fourth of this parliament, would seem to indicate a change of policy on the part of the government; for instead of further reductions in the tariff the present budget proposes a number of increases. The net result of three years of a tariff for revenue government is that the tariff is considerably higher at the present time than it was in 1921. I have a statement before me of the average ad valorem rate of duty on dutiable and total imports for the fiscal years 1920 to 1924 inclusive which shows that the average tariff for the last five years was as follows:

Fiscal years	Average ad valorem rate of duty on	
	Dutiable imports per cent	Total imports per cent
1920..	22.5	14.7
1921..	20.6	14.1
1922..	24.5	16.2
1923..	24.9	16.7
1924..	22.9	15.1

It may be said that those figures do not accurately reflect the true situation as regards the tariff, as the figures are compiled on the basis of averages, but at any rate these figures undoubtedly indicate the general trend of the tariff has been upward during the last three years. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the tariff schedules do not reveal the actual protection afforded by the tariff because of the operation of the special or Anti-dumping Duty Act. To my mind the special or Anti-dumping Duty Act may properly be regarded as the most wicked piece of legislation on the statute books to-day, and it is significant that this government have made no attempt to restrict its power, but have sought rather to enlarge its operation. This special act has been invoked 4,888 times during the past two years, according to a return tabled in this House a few days ago; so it is quite evident the large part it plays in the protection game as played in this country.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, if the facts are as I have stated and the amount of protection afforded by the tariff is really greater to-day than it was in 1921, we are confronted by a most remarkable situation. In the first place, there is the fact that approximately 115 members supporting the government were elected on a platform the chief planks of which emphasized the desirability of reduced tariffs. But that is not all; for in addition to the 115 there were another sixty members elected to this House who were more or less pledged to work for a reduction of tariff. This makes a total of perhaps 160 or