

binders, the duty required after taking into account the duties on raw materials, is not as high as upon an article like a plough which is subject to highly competitive conditions in this country and where the export volume is not as great as in the case of the other article. All these facts have to be taken into account by a Minister of Finance in adjusting the tariff. We might as well make a plain statement about the matter. I think the previous Minister of Finance would say, as I say, that, if today, without taking the duty practically off everything that enters into production, we should substantially reduce those duties say five or ten per cent, we would close up those plants. Hon. gentlemen might say: Close them up. There are \$70,000,000 invested in those plants, and they employ thousands of men. I will give to the Committee an example that I have in mind at the moment. A year or so ago, in the interest of increased production, we put tractors valued at \$1,400 and under upon the free list. Those engaged in the business suffered an immediate and very heavy loss last year, and a great part of the machinery which was manufacturing before is still closed down to-day, and many men have been thrown out of work. The condition of that industry is at present precarious in the extreme, and we can bring all those others to the same condition by just taking the duty off, but I submitted to the House yesterday and I submit to the Committee to-day: Is it in the national interest to do so?

Mr. M. CLARK: I should be very sorry to admit that the minister has, in the last utterance we have heard from him, exhausted the statesmanlike wisdom of which he is capable on this question. I do not believe that the men who are making ploughs are of such weak fibre as my hon. friend represents. I refuse to believe that. I have a personal acquaintance with some hon. gentlemen who are engaged in the plough business and those of them that I know are very, very strong men, men of good fibre. I am sure they would not be put out of business so easily.

There is another side to this question about putting men out of business and throwing men out of work. Is my hon. friend aware that 4,000,000 people have come to Canada since the year 1900? I have heard that phrase "national policy" thrown about here this morning, as if we were not in favour of a national policy. I am tired of hearing that phrase, as if it were the exclusive possession of one par-

ticular school of political thought. I believe in a national policy, beginning from the farm upwards, beginning from the coal and the steel and the iron, which we have just had an illustration of in one of the schedules which we passed this morning. Four million people have come to Canada since 1900, but our total population has not appreciably increased in that time. Would it not be a true national policy to find out what is sending these men out of the country almost as fast as they are coming in? That is the other side to this question, and I submit to the minister, rather more emphatically than I need perhaps, but I can assure him that I speak in emphasis and not in anger, that it is worth looking into. I do not like to be personal in this matter, but I should like to ask my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) if he really believes that the people who are engaged in the plough business are such weak specimens of Canadians that the taking off of the 2½ per cent necessary to put ploughs on the same level as manure spreaders, harrows, drills, and other implements would put these great manufacturing concerns out of business in Canada. I do not believe it, and that is pretty straight talk. I do not believe for a moment that it would put them out of business; I am too good a Canadian to believe it, I believe that Canadians have a little power of competition in them. They were able to compete on the battlefield, and I shall believe in their power of competition in the plough factory, until it seems they are not of the same type of Canadians as competed elsewhere.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Would it be fair to the manufacturers of ploughs and other agricultural implements, in view of the duties they have to pay on iron and steel and the other commodities that form their raw material, and upon coal which they use in their manufactures and upon the machinery which they employ in their processes, to expect them to pay the duties on all these raw materials if the duty was taken off their finished product? I do not believe my hon. friend will say that that is good sense. I am sure he will say that if the duty is to be taken off their finished product, it should be taken off all these raw materials that enter into that product. That leads us to the question whether in the national interests—I do not speak in any narrow sense—I do not say for a moment that my hon. friend has not a national policy, as well as the rest of us, in the