

last analysis that is exactly what this proposition comes down to.

I would like for a few minutes to refer to the application of the budget to my own province of British Columbia. The outlook of the Pacific province is one of commercial, industrial, agricultural and mercantile development. We are a diversified province. We do not make our living entirely by growing wheat or by producing lumber or by following any one particular industry. The natural resources of British Columbia make that province eminently fitted for manufacturing and for commercial and mercantile life, and it is from that aspect that I propose to point out to the government the extent of the injury which is being inflicted by the present budget on the future prosperity of the people of that province.

In order to judge the situation rightly we must find out what the production is in these different natural resources. In 1923 British Columbia produced in agriculture \$55,000,000 worth; fisheries, \$20,000,000; minerals—second only to Ontario—\$44,000,000; forest products, \$82,000,000. It is interesting to note that British Columbia has 50 per cent of the commercial standing timber of Canada. Last year the export of lumber from British Columbia increased by 91 per cent over that of the previous year; the log scale increased 33 per cent. A very large and extensive shipping business is carried on. With respect to sea-going and coastal vessels entering and clearing from Vancouver in 1923 as compared with Montreal, the figures are as follows:

	No. of vessels	Total tonnage
Montreal.. . . .	13,906	14,692,000
Vancouver.. . . .	26,480	14,184,000

In other words the shipping business of Vancouver is about equal to that of Montreal. British Columbia is third in the Dominion in manufacturing as regards number of plants, capital invested, production, and variety of articles produced. The figures I am about to give are taken from statistics compiled by the Department of Industries, being a department of the provincial government at Victoria. The number of articles manufactured last year was 482; number of plants, 2,718, nearly one-half being in Vancouver; number of employees, 41,000, with a pay roll of \$86,000,000 and a capital investment of \$225,000,000; gross value of production, from manufacturing businesses, \$258,000,000. The budget lately brought down, as worked out by the experts in the Vancouver Board of Trade and by business interests in the city—the Vancouver Board of Trade is a very large institution, comprising some two thousand members—the budget as

it relates to the industries of British Columbia, both directly and indirectly in an important way, affects 120 industries with a payroll of \$43,000,000 a year, having 15,300 employees, or one-third of the wage earners of British Columbia. That is what the fiscal policy of this government means to our province; it is a stab at its industrial and commercial future, and it affects directly one-third of the pay-roll and one-third of the wage earners of that province. That is how serious it is.

In order that I may not be accused of speaking in generalities I will refer the government to a memorandum, a copy of which I believe they received, regarding the tariff changes affecting machinery and equipment manufactured in British Columbia, issued by the Metal Trades Employers' section of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, British Columbia division. There are 37 firms concerned, some being very large and important establishments, and the absurdity of the tariff reductions made by the government as affecting British Columbia is so cogently and so emphatically set forth in this memorandum that I hope that the members of the government, and especially the Acting Minister of Finance, will read it again and again. They point out that Washington and Portland, which are the western competitors in certain lines of machinery, have been obliged under the old tariff to sell their machinery in British Columbia at a higher price than the local product. Some may ask, then why object to the reductions in duty? The objection is this: You are again faced with the principle of mass production. In Washington they have a larger market to supply; they have a larger production, and if you reduce the duty a little bit it means increasing their production a great deal and by that surplus or mass production they can put their product on the British Columbia market and force the industries of that province to cease. That is exactly what is going to happen under the arrangement made in connection with the present budget. I understand that certain loggers' associations and other people interested in getting out the natural resources affected by this budget formally requested the government—and I believe they had their inspiration from some sources here—to make the reduction on these implements.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Was there no inspiration in the other case?

Mr. LADNER: Well, the other case is the signed statement of business concerns which are hit by the budget, 37 of them. These are responsible people.