

the discussion that followed that Toronto dealers had asked that the tariff on fruits be reduced.

Mr. Smith urged the fruit growers not to cut themselves loose from the sympathies of those engaged in mixed farming by endeavoring to have the tariff increased, and pointed out that the agricultural population should work together. Each year finds so much more exported from Canada than is imported that the foreign market governs the price. He claimed that as far as fruit growing is concerned it is impossible to increase the selling price by increasing the protection. There are few American fruits that come into competition with the Canadian product, and if the home-grown crop is handled in as careful a manner as the fruit from the States, Canadian growers will be able to balance up later in the season. The tender fruits from the States come when we have none, and as soon as the home crop is ripe the imported goods are not wanted because the quality is inferior.

According to Mr. Smith, a high tariff increases the price of what is to be bought without increasing the value of what is being sold. He cited the case of baskets. Less than three years ago logs were taken across the line, made into baskets, which were shipped back and sold at a lower price than Canadian manufacturers charged, despite the fact that duty had to be paid. One man in the St. Catharines district was \$300 out of pocket on account of the duty on the baskets.

It was pointed out that an export trade is required for our canned goods. To get this trade it will be necessary to reduce the cost of production. A reduction in the price would, also, increase home consumption. The tariff on sugar hinders the development of this industry. The cost of sugar used in canning amounts to one-third the total cost of the goods. Under a reasonable tariff sugar would be much cheaper.

Statistics from the sugar making countries in the south show that the raw sugar can be produced at one and one-half cents a pound. At that price over \$100 an acre can be realized from the land devoted to sugar cane. There is no reason why refined sugar should not retail at three cents, or slightly more. The encouragement of the beet sugar industry in Canada was termed a misfortune, as it cannot prove a success unless under a high tariff or a high bounty.

Mr. Smith concluded by impressing on the growers the fact that a decrease in the price of sugar would cause more fruit to be preserved and canned and stimulate the demand for fruit, which is a health-giving food. He urged that it is not possible to increase the price obtained for fruit by putting the tariff wall higher, but that such action merely imposes a burden on the consumers.

In the discussion Mr. H. Dawson, commission dealer, of Toronto, claimed that it is well to have the consumers acquire the habit of eating our tender fruits before the home crop is ready for market. He pointed out that our chief imports of fruit and vegetables are made in June and July, and that our exports are 1,000 per cent. more than our imports. The fact that the year of low tariff was the year strawberries were cheapest was referred to, and it was noted that low prices mean enormous consumption. Better transportation facilities were mentioned as being more desirable than increased tariff.

Mr. J. L. Hilborn, of Leamington, thought the tariff should be such that it would help to even up for the duty paid on certain implements that have to be used by fruit growers.

It was suggested by Mr. W. Armstrong, of Queenston, that if it could be arranged to admit American products free up to a certain date and shut them out after Canadian fruit is ready for sale that the Cana-