

before the committee now, but I wish to say this, in connection with these reductions on agricultural implements for the benefit of the people of the West, that I am a firm believer in a national policy and the encouragement of industries of all kinds in Canada. But I want to tell the manufacturers of Canada that there will be much greater agitation for still further reductions if they as a body throughout this country, endorse the resolution that was passed in Toronto the other day against public ownership of railways. If that is traced back to the so-called reconstruction organization in Toronto which is dealing with tariff questions, there will be more demand in this country for tariff reductions of this kind than there ever was in the past, and that will all come out of this fact, that the manufacturers of Ontario, from their association assembled in Toronto the other day, called upon the Government to go no further in the matter of public ownership of railways. Perhaps they were trying to prevent the taking over of the Grand Trunk. It will get very rapidly into the minds of the people of the West, as it will into mine, why the manufacturers should step aside from their special mission in order to warn this Government and this Parliament, which has the jurisdiction in this case, that they must not go any further in the matter of public ownership of railways.

Mr. PEDLOW: Would the minister explain the reason for the different classifications of farm implements for taxation purposes?

As most of these are manufactured in one shape or form in this country, I cannot see why there should be a variation in the protection afforded or the duty collected. For instance, the item under consideration, No. 446, names 10 per cent, 15 per cent and 15 per cent. Then the five succeeding items that have not yet come under discussion, but which are in the same line of products, are classified under a different classification and a different rate of duty collected in each case. Why should they not all come under the same tariff schedule? They are farm implements; they are manufactured in Canada and many of them are manufactured in the same shop. He can certainly get along with the same rates on ploughs or if he must have 17½ on some articles why should a rate of 10 per cent, 15 per cent and 15 per cent be charged on cultivators, harrows and so forth, and 12½ per cent, 17½ per cent and 17½ per cent on ploughs? These

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

two items are produced by the same workmen in the same shops.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is my hon. friend's idea that they should all be subject to a duty of 17½ per cent?

Mr. PEDLOW: No, I think they should all be subject to a duty of 10 per cent, 15 per cent and 15 per cent.

Mr. EDWARDS: The reason why I asked that question was because my hon. friend apparently last night was willing to let them stay at 20 per cent. I do not understand how he can advocate a reduction now and say he wants them all reduced to 15 per cent. He certainly put himself on record as being opposed to the reduction which is being made.

Mr. PEDLOW: It would be well for the hon. member to explain how he arrives at that conclusion.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The variation in duties is not peculiar to this partial revision of the schedule. The variation has existed for many years.

Mr. PEDLOW: Why?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I explained a few moments ago, I think, pretty fully as to why. My predecessor, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) had, under his tariff of 1907, a duty on binders of 17½ per cent, and upon cultivators, ploughs, harrows, etc., of 20 per cent. (I am quoting the general tariff.) Upon hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, etc., the duty under his tariff was 25 per cent.

Mr. BUREAU: That is twenty-two years ago.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, it is not twenty-two years ago, if I may correct my hon. friend; it is twelve years ago, but many modifications have been made since then. For example, we have been able to reduce the duty on binders to 12½ per cent, as I stated a little while ago. Many facts must be taken into consideration. In the first place, there is the question of market, and of volume of business capable of being transacted. For example, the Massey-Harris Company, which is one of the largest concerns in the world, has an immense overseas trade, and I need not tell hon. members that the cost of production depends upon the volume of business. In the case of the International Harvester Company and the Massey Harris Company in connection with a standard article like