

report without the instructions of somebody superior to them. When the budget proposals were brought down this session it was proposed by the Acting Minister of Finance to amend the old anti-dumping clause in the Customs Tariff 1907 which has never been touched yet. We do not know the reasons of the Acting Minister of Finance for that suggestion, and I myself was unable to find out what the new wording meant. It came as rather a shock to the House, and a shock to the fruit growers in the west, when six days later the minister announced the withdrawal of the proposed amendment. His explanation for taking that step was rather a curious one. He said:

In the presentation of the budget I gave notice of a certain resolution to amend the dumping clauses. Since that time I have had further consultation with the officers of the department and have reached the conclusion that the dumping clauses as now incorporated in our act are considered sufficient to properly determine the value for duty purposes. Consequently I take this opportunity of advising hon. members that when we reach the committee stage I shall withdraw that resolution.

Does that really mean that the reason for withdrawing the proposed amendment was that the officials of the Customs department had not previously given their opinion on it, and consequently it was withdrawn? I can hardly believe that was the only reason. I am inclined to think that certain pressure must have been brought to bear upon the government just about that time and, having rather flouted certain interests in the west with regard to the budget proposals, it now thought it advisable to just concede something, and the proposed amendment was therefore dropped.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

### After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I had very nearly completed the remarks which I wish to make respecting the fruit industry. There are, however, two things to which I wish to refer. I spoke of the small protection under which the fruit industry had been organized and had carried on to the considerable success which it has attained in British Columbia. I said "small" advisedly, for if you will examine the return which the Minister of Customs and Excise (Mr. Bureau) recently brought down, you will find that the average percentage of duty on all exports, both dutiable and free, which came into Canada, in the

last five years amounted to 16.03 per cent. The similar figure for the last five years on apples, which constitute the largest bulk of the fruit produced in British Columbia, is but 12.4 per cent, 20 per cent less than the average duty protecting the industries of Canada when compared with the quantity which is brought in both dutiable and free. That, I consider, at the present time is adequate protection, and I do not think anybody could call it a high protection. I wish also to reiterate what I referred to before, and that is the satisfaction which I feel in recognizing a less harsh view adopted by hon. members on my left towards the fruit industry of British Columbia. They have been proceeding along co-operative lines. So have we. What we desire now is to see a greater measure of co-operation between British Columbia and the three neighbouring provinces. Why do I not hear hon. members on my left requesting the government to take action to clean up these filthy trade habits in the handling of fruit in our domestic market? The interests of the producer and the consumer in this matter are one. Why should I want to receive forty cents a box for my apples and the consumer in the prairie provinces pay three or four dollars a box? That is not to my interest, and I appeal to hon. members to my left to assist in this matter, to help us to clean up this disgraceful state of affairs in the three prairie provinces. I take it that they desire, as all true Canadians do, a movement towards the development of Canada for Canada's sake. That applies to the Canadian-born as it also applies to people like myself who are endeavouring, in however small a way, to do something for the country of their adoption. What we wish is that Canadian industries which are planted in this country should develop and continue and supply the needs of Canada.

I am glad to notice the removal of an anomaly under the sales tax. For several years past nursery stock has been on the exempted list under the sales tax; but by a curious decision by some official of the Department of Customs and Excise, tomato plants were considered to be something on which sales tax should be charged. A tomato plant has no value of itself, it has only a potential value. It is not until it is planted out in the same way that a rose-cutting is planted out that it has any value whatever. I see by the proposals of the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) that this anomaly has been removed. But there is another piece of discrimination under the sales tax to which my predecessor drew attention in this House in