

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I think that substantiates my point that in setting the duty the differential in freight should be considered, because that in itself is a protection.

Mr. DUNNING: But it will vary throughout Canada.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): This is just for the prairie provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and I am speaking particularly for Alberta. I think the point is clear that if the other provinces wish that protection and the freight does not enter into the matter, all well and good. However, we in Alberta certainly have to consider the freight, and when we find that the protection which would in this way be afforded comes up to between 100 per cent and 200 per cent, surely we should have special consideration. Possibly I should go further and say that the three provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta should have it. A regional duty should be put on in that case. Let British Columbia and the eastern provinces do as they wish; if they do not want regional protection, that is their own funeral. However, I do not see why we out in the west should be made to suffer because British Columbia does not wish to consider the difference in freight.

I shall give the figures I have before me, and if they are wrong I should like to be corrected. The invoiced price is seventy-five cents on a crate weighing thirty-five pounds. The quotation is given as of June 30, 1934. The minimum seasonal duty of thirty per cent would be all right, but if thirty per cent of the invoice value was less than the amount realized from two cents per pound, the weight of the package included, the latter would apply. This would make a total of seventy cents. There we have a duty of seventy cents on a case originally costing seventy-five cents, or almost 100 per cent. The value for duty invoiced was seventy-five cents. Then, there is in addition three cents a pound on thirty-five pounds, or \$1.05. That makes a total of \$1.80. I am coming to what my hon. friend referred to as the dumping duty. The set valuation, according to that, would be \$1.80, which would exceed the invoice by \$1.05; that is, if you subtract the one from the other you get \$1.05. That is fifty per cent more on the value for duty, or fifty per cent of \$1.80, which would be ninety cents. That would be the dumping duty on tomatoes. If this is not correct I should like to be informed. I say that there is ninety cents of a dumping duty, and there is an excise tax of three per cent.

Mr. DUNNING: I may tell my hon. friend that, worked out actually and on a fair average over a period of years, the duty prior to January 1 per crate of tomatoes would be approximately \$1.65, whereas the duty on the first day of January under the agreement, on the same crate of tomatoes, would approximate sixty-eight cents.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Not taking into consideration the question of freight.

Mr. DUNNING: We are talking about duties, not about freights.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I understand that. But does the minister not realize also that, missing that point, he is penalizing us in the prairie provinces?

Mr. REID: If the hon. gentleman's reasoning is correct, why was it that last year we in British Columbia paid more for British Columbia tomatoes than he did in Alberta?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): That will be something for you to work out internally.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman undertakes to give us the answer; let him answer that question.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): The growers in British Columbia are protected; we in Alberta pay through the nose all the way round.

Mr. REID: I am giving the hon. gentleman facts; let him also give us facts.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): There is a seasonal duty of seventy cents on that article; the dumping duty is ninety cents; excise tax, four cents, and there is also the freight differential of 51 cents, which makes a total protection of \$2.15 on an article which originally cost seventy-five cents. If you call that fair dealing with the western provinces then I want to be shown.

Mr. CLARK (Essex): Coming from the earliest producing district in Canada I should like to give some figures. The average selling price of an eleven-quart basket of tomatoes in 1935 was 41.5 cents. That was through the largest cooperative in that early producing district.

Mr. BENNETT: How many pounds?

Mr. CLARK (Essex): Fifteen. The hon. member for Bow River is mistaken in one respect. The duty on natural products is not added on to the Canadian product. We still sell in a supply and demand market, as is shown by the price we receive for our products.