

are in committee, we want to know why these tariffs have been framed in a way in which heretofore they have never been framed. Do hon. gentlemen opposite realize that in days gone by when my friend (Sir Henry Drayton) was Minister of Finance, he went from one end of the country to the other holding public hearings in order that people might make representations as to how they felt the tariff should be framed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Nothing came out of it.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman never got the opportunity, because an election ensued.

Mr. CANNON: Pass on to another point.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sorry that hon. gentlemen are so vociferous in their applause. I had not expected to meet with their approval to that extent.

May I make this observation—and I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will agree with me—that a tariff thus prepared is not a tariff to which the Canadian people can give their assent without the closest scrutiny of every item. I do not propose to discuss these items at length, but this I will say, that when these tariff resolutions are in committee, as no opportunity has been afforded to those vitally affected as should have been done, this house will require the widest possible explanation to justify the action that has been taken. Why? Let me give an illustration. Why should the cotton industry at one point have the duties greatly increased? Why put a duty on cotton yarn and leave woollen yarn free? Why these inconsistencies? Why should you, when there is but one mill in all Canada making a given product, increase its protection, and deny protection to another industry? Why put a drawback on coal that was not asked for?

Mr. MALCOLM: It was asked for.

Mr. BENNETT: The records of the tariff board do not show it.

Mr. MALCOLM: No. I have asked for it a good many sessions.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, it has been worth all this just to get that admission. There is one thing we know now that we did not know before. This is not a tariff with which the board had anything to do at all. It is what might be called a log-rolling tariff; that is the kind of tariff it is. If my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce had his wishes met and is satisfied, peradventure others with similar desires had their wishes

met. That will make good reading, Mr. Speaker, as to how a tariff is framed.

There is another matter that might be mentioned. I am not going into details, but with regard to the general trend of these tariff schedules I would point out that steadily we have been increasing our imports from the United States, and steadily our exports have been declining. We made implements practically free, and what has been happening? We find our imports of agricultural implements increasing. Let me read what the United States says about Canadian trade. Let me read what came out in the February 13, 1928, issue of Commerce Reports issued by the United States Department of Commerce.

Mr. POWER: Is this an observation?

Mr. BENNETT: I think it may convince even my hon. friend. This is not an observation; it is a written document. At page 437 the report says:

The outstanding feature of the shipments of agricultural implements during the year 1927 was the large total that went to Canada, amounting to \$29,791,472 which was 33 per cent of the total shipped to all countries, and which exceeded the shipments to all of Europe by more than \$8,000,000. Canadian purchases in 1927 were the largest ever reported and were greater than the average shipments to all countries in the years prior to 1918.

This is the United States, remember, upon this subject:

These large Canadian purchases resulted from the material betterment of conditions in Ontario and the prairie provinces, especially Saskatchewan and Alberta, where American tractors, threshing machines, and harvesters were sold much more extensively than in 1926. Purchases of wheel tractors were exceptionally large, amounting to 15,749 valued at \$12,421,105 as compared with 8,173 valued at \$6,823,648 in 1926. Sales of American implements in Canada have been showing consistent and rapid increases during the past three years and, since each of these years has been a good crop year, the buying power of the farming population has been materially enhanced. It is also worthy of note that exports of implements to Canada comprised 90 per cent of shipments to all of North America, including Central America and the West Indies, and exceeded those to all of South America by \$10,000,000.

There is one question I would put both to my hon. friends to my left and to hon. gentlemen before me. Reading that document I ask them, in view of the fact that the price of agricultural implements is a little higher now than it was when the duty was taken off, because of economic and other conditions, whether or not they believe now that the removal of that duty effected any useful purpose to Canada. I go further. I put in front of them that statement which shows that at