

packers and the buyers on the prairies are very much strained. The prairie provinces will be glad to buy their fruit in Canada, but I would advise the producers or British Columbia salesmen not to antagonize their best market.

Some beneficial changes have been announced in the budget. The one great change that I want to see yet is the elimination of this dumping act, and until then the people of this country will not have the freedom to which they are entitled.

Another change which I should like to see is that all bounties which were granted last year to certain industries should also be abolished. Why should we give a bounty to what is called the artificial silk industry? It is protected under the ordinary duty relating to cottons, and cotton it is. Why should we also give to a rich company in this country a bounty up to a quarter of a million dollars for making their own copper or brass rods, while on all that the people will have to buy and use, they have to pay 30 per cent duty? Is there any fairness in this? Will any member on the government side, when he speaks next, tell us why they have to link up with all those industries by tariff, bonuses, and bounties? Why are the people shackled through the tariff in all their operations?

Let me deal with a few of the general remarks that have been made in this debate. A good deal has lately been said regarding the Laurier-Fielding tariff, and our protectionist tariff friends here have sighed for Fielding and his stability. As regards the Laurier-Fielding tariff, there has never been anything in Canada by way of a tariff that could rightly be called by that name, and the name of the Grand Old Man should not be coupled in this connection with it. The development of what I like to term as the "communism of pelf" reached its height, it is true, under the Liberal administration in the year 1906 or 1907. Despite the fact that Mr. Fielding was a member of the resolutions committee at the great convention in this city in 1893, at the tariff revision of the session of 1906-07, he piloted the Tariff Act through this House in the spirit of a Dingley or a McKinley. It is a noted fact to-day—and let history be fair—that the Prime Minister through it all was significantly silent. He was a disappointed man with his party. Being a free trader, he was disappointed, and through the whole piloting of that Tariff Act of 1906-07, Sir Wilfrid Laurier was significantly silent. The one thing that surprises us now is that Sir Wilfrid Laurier stayed with his party trying to please two factions, with a consequent stultification of his better self. But it is

wrong and an injustice to couple his name with that of the Minister of Finance of that date as regards the tariff.

I was pleased the other day to see in a Montreal paper a statement by the Massey-Harris Company. I do not think I need trouble to read it as this House is pretty well acquainted with it. It is a statement that is calculated to create a better feeling between the different classes of this country. Let me read one part:

The Canadian manufacturer of farm implements has been in a measure compensated for the loss of protection on the finished goods by modification of the customs tariff on the materials and so on which he uses. Heretofore, many material items carried a rate of duty greater than that which applied to the finished implements, and in this respect the industry was handicapped. The lowering of these duties, together with further adjustments just made, has remedied these inconsistencies and so far as the Massey-Harris Company is concerned, we shall endeavour to adjust ourselves to the new conditions and we will give to the Canadian farmer every possible advantage arising out of the changes made. We rely upon him to do everything within his power to stimulate Canadian industry by the purchase of Canadian made machines.

That is a significant utterance coming at this time. I would advise other Canadian manufacturers to show something of the same spirit.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How much of a reduction will the hon. member expect in the price of agricultural implements as a result of the changes in the tariff? What reduction on a binder will be satisfactory?

Mr. EVANS: I could not say offhand what the appraisement of a binder is.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is \$280 or \$300.

Mr. EVANS: It is more than that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The hon. member would naturally expect to have a reduction of as much as the sales tax would amount to.

Mr. EVANS: Quite that and we are promised even the reduction of the tariff. How puny are such statements made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), when he says that the present budget will close down our industries and that we shall lose the industrial supremacy we have. At page 1754 of Hansard he is reported as saying:

The International Harvester Company can now close its doors in Hamilton and manufacture in Chicago. The money invested in Hamilton is just so much waste and the plant can now be scrapped.

I have heard it said that Hamilton is a city that was built by protection. All I say is that what has built Hamilton is what has de-