

Pacific coast, but I do know that the engines manufactured in the Maritime provinces are not equal to the engines that can be procured by our fishermen across the line. If our manufacturers wish to secure and retain business in the Maritime provinces, they must pay more attention to turning out an engine that is adapted for use in salt water—that is, for the work our fishermen are engaged in.

Mr. LADNER: Will the hon. gentleman tell us in a practical way to what extent a fisherman in the Maritime provinces would benefit in dollars and cents by buying an American engine, and how long that engine will last for his work?

Mr. SNOWBALL: I am not a fisherman and therefore cannot give a practical answer to my hon. friend's question. Members interested from the Maritime provinces may be able to deal with the matter more specifically. I may say, however,

5 p.m. that fishermen have told me that the engines they buy in the Maritime provinces have lasted only four or five years, whereas similar engines purchased across the line have been giving satisfactory service for fifteen or sixteen years and are still going strong.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What engines of Canadian make have failed?

Mr. SNOWBALL: The ones I refer to are manufactured in the Maritime provinces, at New Glasgow, Charlottetown and, I think, Yarmouth.

Mr. MARTELL: May I call the hon. member's attention to the fact that in certain parts of Nova Scotia the fishermen imported engines from Ontario, made by a certain firm called Adams at Penetanguishene, but they did not last two years in salt water.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What was the name of the engine imported from Ontario?

Mr. MARTELL: It was manufactured by a company, formerly known as the Adams Company, at a place called Penetanguishene, or some such name, in Ontario.

Mr. SNOWBALL: I wish I were an expert, Mr. Chairman, so that I might satisfy my hon. friend. I am voicing the sentiments of the fishermen in my constituency, who tell me that they should have had this reduction granted to them last year when the duties on agricultural implements and machinery used in lumbering were reduced. However, I am glad that this boon has been granted to them at last. Every year it is becoming more important that our fishermen should get

[Mr. Snowball.]

further out from shore in following their business, and it is necessary that they should have their boats equipped with reliable gasoline engines so that when a storm comes up they may get back to shelter as quickly as possible; in fact their lives may depend on the efficiency of their engines. These men have told me that they should be able to buy the American engine, and they have asked for this reduction time and again; indeed, they would like to see the whole duty removed. I cannot see why any of our manufacturers who have been producing a satisfactory type of engine cannot continue to prosper under the small reduction of duty now proposed. We heard a great deal during the past year of the disaster that would befall the manufacturers of farming implements as a result of the reduction of duty on their output, but I do not think any hon. gentleman can name a single one that has gone out of business since that reduction went into effect. And I shall be very much surprised if, when we return to this House next session, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre will be able to tell us that owing to this reduction in duty the manufacturing concerns that he has referred to have been driven out of business. If they are manufacturing as good a type of engine as their American competitors, I am sure they will be in business for many years to come. Certainly I hope they will not go out of business, simply to demonstrate the fact that they are not able to manufacture a real highclass engine and hold their own with the engine turned out by their competitors in the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Chairman, the debate on this resolution so far indicates that the old subject of protection versus free trade is going to be discussed all over again. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Snowball) says he cannot understand why the Canadian manufacturer cannot carry on under a low tariff or no tariff. I think the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) gave a good illustration why in connection with the dumping clause of the Customs Act, dealt with a few minutes ago when he pointed out that on a certain date last year about a million pounds of butter, or forty carloads, had been imported from the United States at a time when the market there was glutted, and butter prices went down, but they went up there as soon as the surplus was dumped on our market. That very thing is happening all over this country, and is, I believe, responsible for the demoralized condition of trade which we find throughout the Dominion to-day.