

him in hand; but if there is no one available among his colleagues, I would remind him that we have an ample supply of medical gentlemen on this side of the house.

The people to whom I have referred, Mr. Speaker, would like to be employed in their own country, they would like to remain at home. There is one thing that will enable them to do this—the protection of our factories in the same way as their competitors are protected in the United States. That is what our industries are suffering from to-day, lack of protection. An example of how thoroughly the government of the United States protects its industries was cited by an hon. member on this side of the house a few days ago. He told the house how a shipment of Canadian materials was held in bond in the United States until the duty had been raised to such a point that the Canadian manufacturer had to take back the shipment, the price under the higher duty being prohibitive to his customer. Let me give the house a quotation from Toronto Saturday Night of November 14, 1925. This is not up to date, but it will give hon. members some idea of the procedure followed by the United States authorities in preserving their home market for their own manufacturers. I could give other citations, but I do not desire to detain the house. This is from the columns of Saturday Night:

For instance, a Canadian house manufacturing Christmas cards had managed to pick up quite a trade south of the international boundary under a duty of fifteen per cent. However, this was not for long, as keen United States business men in the same line of trade called the attention of the proper official to the situation and instantly the import duty into the United States was raised to forty-five per cent and the Canadian manufacturer found himself out in the cold.

Stapells-Fletcher, Limited, are Canadian manufacturers of ladies' dresses. An enterprising salesman while calling on the Windsor, Ont., trade resolved to venture into Detroit with the idea that perhaps he might land an order, even if the duty against him was fifty per cent. He did and came back jubilant. The gowns were shipped to Detroit, but alas they never got any farther than the customs house, for there the shipment was met by a special appraiser who instantly jumped the duty from fifty to ninety per cent, and the order in due course found its way back into the warehouse of the Canadian manufacturer.

To quote one more instance, though no doubt firms by the dozen have had a similar experience. A. T. Reid & Co. manufacture neckware and dress accessories. Orders were taken in United States under the fifty per cent duty then ruling. But upon making delivery it was found that it had been suddenly raised to ninety per cent thus shutting them out of the market.

Of course we have no right to complain over what Uncle Sam does with his tariff. That is solely his own business. However we may, I think, legitimately take issue with the manner

[Mr. Price.]

in which we freely import like goods from the United States. For instance, in the fiscal year 1924 Uncle Sam sent us in cotton, silk and woollen clothing, designed for women and children, goods to the value of \$4,318,000. Just the sort of things that our Canadian manufacturers were trying to sell in the United States. In the fiscal year 1925 the importation of a like class of clothing from the United States amounted to \$4,069,000. Of course these figures take no account of smuggled goods of like character that have been pouring into this country.

Under the circumstances it seems to me that in justice to our own people, and in view of the action of the United States customs department which makes it quite impossible for Canadian manufacturing concerns to invade the United States trade, our citizen workmen are entitled to the home market.

As against that policy pursued in the United States, their promptness of action and their desire to throw a protecting arm around their industries in order to keep them going and to retain their own labourers at home, giving employment to all their mechanics, what condition do we find in Nova Scotia, for example? There is the concern which I mentioned a few minutes ago, the Consumers' Cordage Company of Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, which is a subsidiary of a Montreal house. This company has been operating there for some years and employs about 200 workmen, a great many of them skilled mechanics. A request has been made of this administration for some protection on half inch rope—

Mr. RALSTON: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. PRICE: I will not be interrupted.

Mr. RALSTON: Is the hon. member in favour of a duty on fishermen's rope?

Mr. PRICE: Has the matter been adjusted? Have they been given protection?

Mr. RALSTON: I am simply asking whether the hon. member is in favour of imposing a duty on fishermen's rope.

Mr. PRICE: My time is going and I must proceed. In this case some protection might have proved beneficial, but so far as I know nothing has been done to alleviate the condition. Industrial expansion of any appreciative character will never materialise under the policy pursued by this government. It is a policy which is not in harmony with development; it is a "leave it to George" policy. It is disinterested.

In my opinion the government has been riding two horses, and those whom hon. gentlemen opposite have thought to be asleep are finding them out. I recall only a session or two ago when the lobbies were filled with members from the front benches of the present