

My main objection to the government's proposal is the fact that once more it has turned a deaf ear to the growers' request for something in the nature of an emergency tariff. Foreign countries with surplus production of certain fruits and vegetables endeavour to keep that production off their own markets because the price, there, would be broken. They look around for some unprotected spot to which they can send their perishable commodities, and in this particular instance Canada is next to such a neighbour. The surplus production of the United States is tipped into our markets at various times. When the glut is coming into the Canadian market the price is so low that the ad valorem rate is not the higher, and the specific rate is insufficient. So far as I know, the grower has never asked that the specific rate shall be raised to such a height as would make the price such as to prohibit the foreigner marketing his products in Canada.

Two winters ago the producers of British Columbia sent a delegation through the western provinces in an endeavour to meet the opposition which they were prone to believe existed in that part of the country. That delegation met associations of farmers; it met representatives of labour; it met the press; it met the cooperative societies; it met responsible individuals, and it was careful to explain that its mission was not to discuss a general rise in the tariff—that part of the case had already been submitted in detail to the tariff advisory board—it was there to meet supposed opponents and make sure that the view of the producer was correctly explained. The members of the delegation returned home to British Columbia with renewed hope because of the kindly feelings which had been expressed toward their view.

As I said before, the government has once more refrained from doing anything which will be of the slightest assistance to the producer in taking care of the glut in importations. At the present time nothing stands between the producers and these importations except what one might call the toy clause of the Liberal government. That clause was inserted in the Customs Act in 1922 and requires the passing of an order in council to make it operative, which order in council this government has never passed. An order in council was passed in 1926, which this government proceeded to use when they returned to power. Subsequent orders in council were passed which provided some effective protection, but when the fanatical free trade supporters of the government blew up all those orders in council were rescinded. We are now in the position in which

we were before. It seems to me to be quite unreasonable that we should be expected to rely on that impotent clause of the Liberal government, precious to them because it replaces one which they repealed and which had been put into effect by their predecessors. That previous clause took some cognizance of the costs of production. However, the Liberal government said: to consider the costs of production is unworkable, and they ignored the fact that that clause had been in operation with satisfactory results. The Liberal government has not in the past shown any desire to pass the necessary orders in council, and it seems to think that recantations at this late date will appeal to the fruit growers.

One of the reasons for repealing the orders in council in 1928, was a letter written by the Department of Justice. This letter stated as an opinion, but not as a ruling, that it was improper to use the dumping clause on articles carrying a specific tariff. A few days ago a despatch from Ottawa appeared on the front page of the Vancouver Daily Province which stated that now that the government had imposed an ad valorem duty on fruit it would be possible to use the dumping clause in the future for the assistance of the apple grower. I cannot imagine the apple grower believing that this government would pass an order in council to help him in view of the way it has flouted him all these past years. When the glut importation of apples is entering Canada, the price is low and the ad valorem duty is not the higher. The specific duty is insufficient, but it is not to apply because of the letter from the Department of Justice saying that it is improper to impose the dumping clause in relation to articles carrying a specific tariff.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): That is not what it said.

Mr. STIRLING: Does the government really think that the fruit and vegetable grower is such an arrant ass as to believe in these late protestations of assistance? The thought passing through the mind of the fruit and vegetable grower is quite different; it is similar to that couplet written many years ago:

The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be,
The devil was well, the devil a monk was he.

These gluts to which I have been referring do not occur every year, nor in succeeding years do they occur in regard to the same fruit or vegetable nor even in the same variety