

What shall we say to this system which allows a practice of this kind? I repeat that our protectionist tariff system as it stands today is absolutely dishonourable and dishonest with respect to the working man and the farmer. A higher tariff is advocated in order to provide work for our people, when our supposed manufacturers can go across to the United States and have these machines built there and brought into the country free of duty, while the amount of the duty is included in the price paid by the farmers purchasing them.

There are many companies in Canada today which do not need tariff protection at all. I have in my hand a clipping from the *Ottawa Citizen* of November 24 last, stating that Dominion Cottons are to split their shares again and that they are running to 90 per cent of their capacity. They have the power of price-fixing in connection with all their goods as it is, but our friends in the House of Commons are daily advocating a higher protective duty on those articles of clothing needed by our working people. I mention this fact because this company made very high profits, particularly during the war.

The Minister of Finance told us that the tariff advisory board had not had time in which to advise the government. According to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) the tariff advisory board also has a number of advisers, so it seems that these advisers to the tariff board have not advised the board to advise the Minister of Finance to advise the government to put some of these articles on the free list. This is the question I want to ask: Did the tariff advisory board advise the Minister of Finance to place plate glass on the free list for the sake of manufacturers, when used in their factories only, while the finished article carries a duty of 27 per cent and 30 per cent? Mr. Speaker, the entire budget this year was concocted with the manufacturers at the elbow of the minister.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): As usual.

Mr. EVANS: As usual, as my hon. friend says. In view of what we know of the tariff system and how it is maintained, it is only logical to conclude that the tariff advisory board is just a link between the manufacturers and the party managers; no doubt the personnel of the board will be changed if there is a change of government. This will be a little more expeditious than the reform of the senate, which the Prime Minister at a picnic in Saskatchewan last summer said was proceeding at a very satisfactory pace indeed.

When the hon. member for South Wellington was speaking he advocated a higher tariff against the United States and declared that this action should be taken in the interests of the manufacturers even if it did prevent the farmers of Canada from finding a market for about \$100,000,000 worth of grain and cattle. The hon. member gave a long list of farm products with a total value of between \$95,000,000 and \$100,000,000, which would be affected, and said it would be only a temporary embarrassment. Evidently it did not matter to him that thousands of ranchers and farmers would be put out of business. He said we had nothing to fear in this respect; he urged drastic action on the part of the government and said if this government would not act some other government would do so. According to his suggestion, Canada should be hermetically sealed against outside competition for the sake of a class which has relied on the tariff for dividends because of its own incompetence, placing the burden of the tariff on the class which is able to meet outside competition. Because we oppose their greedy desires in this respect this hon. gentleman dubs us hard-shelled, thick-skinned free traders. The only thing of concern to the class for which he speaks is the privilege of fleecing all the consumers of Canada, and he moves an amendment which is nothing but a baited trap to catch unwary agriculturists. He condemns the Australian treaty—as far as that goes I do myself—but he forgets that that treaty was entered into to provide an advantage for the class for whom he speaks; the class who, he says, cannot exist except they become more and more the wards of this nation; the class for whose benefit the consumers of Canada paid \$550,000,000 last year because of the \$185,000,000 collected for revenue. The hon. gentleman said that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) could settle the question of unemployment with half a dozen strokes of his pen.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Mr. G. S. RENNIE (East Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on the budget and also on the tariff changes which have been brought down, referring especially to the way they affect the city of Hamilton, which I have the honour to represent. A friend of mine asked me the other day just what I thought of the budget, and I told him there was very little in it. He agreed with me and told me that he had come to the conclusion that you could not budge-it; that as it was a government measure