

class, such as fishermen, whom these reductions are supposed to benefit. I have here a copy of a letter which has already been placed on Hansard. I shall not read it at length but I wish to refer to it. It deals for instance with the effect of the tariff reductions on local manufacturers. In the case of the Britannia Wire Rope Company, it is shown that the amendments of last year have resulted in a serious curtailment of business, throwing a number of workmen out of employment. Let me cite an instance.

In the early part of 1924 the Canadian Sumner Iron Works and one other Canadian company were bidding on the entire list of equipment for one of the largest mills in the province, namely, that of the Victoria Lumber & Manufacturing Company of Chemainus. Before the bids were closed the tariff reductions of April 11, 1924, came into effect and the entire order, which would have represented business retained in Canadian plants of approximately \$200,000 if placed with the local plant, was placed with the Diamond Iron Works of Minneapolis. That is an illustration of the effect of reducing the tariff. Here was an order of \$200,000 lost to a Canadian firm; and there was no particular demand for the reduction in question. The same thing applies exactly to the item now before us dealing with gas engines. I am sure that the result will be a loss of business to Canadian firms and consequent unemployment; and further than that it will involve a loss of capital invested in these businesses. I will ask the minister to follow the good example which he himself set in dropping the dumping clause and leave this clause out of the list. If he does so he will win a good deal of gratitude from a very deserving people. It may be too late to make this appeal but I submit it to the minister anyway.

Mr. ROBB: I am afraid it is.

Mr. STEVENS: I am exceedingly sorry that the minister should take that stand.

Mr. EVANS: I am glad that the government has decided to take the duty off engines for fishermen, for if there is a class of men in primary production who need encouragement it is the fishermen, particularly those who are in business in a small way. There is no duty on raw fish. It is when this commodity gets into the manufacturer's hands for curing that the duty is put on. And there I find fault with the government to-day; they favour organized industry as against those who are engaged in primary production such as farmers and fishermen. Organized industry is protected all the way through, but nothing is done to make the cost of living come down.

Regarding the contention of the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) that some of these concerns will be put out of business, I do not see why they should be. I do not see the use of trying to bolster up such an industry, because by their plea for tariff protection they admit that the finished article they produce is worth less than the raw material and the labour they put into it. There are plenty of vocations for Canadians to engage in, and if it is more profitable for our people to fish than to make gasoline engines, they will adjust themselves accordingly. I think the hon. member's contention is based on what over and over again has been proved to be a fallacy of the very first rank.

Mr. McISAAC: Mr. Chairman, why should the fishermen of the Maritime provinces be compelled to pay a higher price for an inferior article? Every fisherman will tell you that an American engine will last at least twice as long as an engine made in this country, because the former is built to better withstand the action of salt water. It is therefore the fault of such concerns as the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) refers to that our fishermen will not buy their output. Then why should all the fishermen of Canada be penalized? If our manufacturers had the enterprise to turn out the right quality engine, they would find our fishermen would buy them in preference to the engine built by their American competitors.

Mr. STEVENS: May I correct my hon. friend in one regard? He says that the American engine will last twice as long as the engine built in Canada. That is not the case with respect to the engine turned out by the concern to which I have referred. Their engine has been demonstrated to be in every way satisfactory. The trouble is our manufacturers with a comparatively small market have to compete with the massed production south of the line. The same applies to the arguments advanced by my hon. friend from Saskatoon, which I will deal with in a moment or two.

Mr. McISAAC: I do not know about British Columbia engines, but I do know that what I have said applies to engines purchased in the Maritime provinces.

Mr. SNOWBALL: I desire to commend the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) for the reduction he has made in the duty on gasoline engines for use by our fishermen. This will be a boon to the fishermen in the Maritime provinces. I am not conversant with gasoline engines manufactured on the