

The situation is very similar with regard to mica. In Quebec and Ontario we have mica ore of the very finest quality, but we do not help this industry as the United States helps the mica industry of that country. When the ore is taken from the mine in Canada and sent to the United States unwashed and with no labour expended on it, it is admitted free, but just as soon as there is any Canadian labour applied to it the duty begins, and it ascends from that point. In other words, the intention is to provide work in the United States by taking that work away from Canada.

Another question which should be considered by the government is the application of the vegetable growers for consideration. It may seem strange that the representative of an urban constituency should speak on behalf of the vegetable growers, but I believe we in the cities realize that if you have a prosperous urban community you will have a prosperous rural community and vice versa, because the two things cannot be separated. There are a great many people throughout Canada engaged in growing vegetables, and they certainly should receive some consideration from this government. The vegetables which would be affected most by any duty would be those which might be called the rich man's vegetables, and in that case he can well afford to pay for them, but in any event, this association of vegetable growers should receive consideration from this government, which they certainly do not now receive.

For a number of years, in connection with providing more work throughout Canada, I have brought to the attention of the government the question of the direction of steamship companies. The United States will not permit a board of directors to have Canadian representation, while in Canada it is only necessary to have one Canadian representative, which gives to these Americans the control of our shipping and takes work away from our Canadian sailors and steamships. In the same way I brought to the attention of the government the question of repair work on damaged ships. When an American boat is damaged in Canadian waters it is taxed 50 per cent for the necessary repair work when it returns to the United States, while Canada only charges 25 per cent. Therefore, under these regulations, no work will be done to American bottoms on Canadian shores.

Another item in the budget which interests my constituency is the small protection given for the manufacture of locomotives and other machinery required in the mining industry. If there is one industry in Canada which should be supported by work done in Canada it is

the mining industry. The Canadian Locomotive Works in Kingston have started to manufacture locomotives, engines and other things required in mining, and I would ask the government to see that this industry is given a little more protection than is provided by this budget, in order that this work may be carried on in Canada.

There is still another matter to which the budget does not refer, but which is of primary importance in our section of the country. I refer to the St. Lawrence development. Eastern Ontario is somewhat divided in this matter, and while I believe everything that can be said has been brought out, I would like to draw the attention of the government to the fact that the development of the St. Lawrence is not only an engineering question but that it is also a question of navigation, and the advice of navigators and marine men should be taken into consideration when considering whether or not this great work should be proceeded with.

After having referred to these local matters I would like to say a few words on the budget as a whole. One would naturally expect a certain amount of independent criticism from the other side of the chamber, especially since we have across the way an independent wing which moved from this side of the house, led by our good friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Forke). More especially would this independent criticism be expected since on more than one occasion the Minister of Immigration has expressed himself very strongly from the front benches of this side of the house. I would like to ask him how he views this budget to-day, in the light of what he said in past years. Let me speak more specifically. In 1924 he declared that the budget should be a financial statement showing the commitments and liabilities of the country so plainly that the man in the street might easily understand it. If the Minister of Immigration believes this budget to be so plain that the man in the street can understand it, he has acquired since crossing the floor a wider viewpoint than he had while on this side of the house. In 1923, while leading this independent wing, the same gentleman expressed himself very strongly and moved an amendment to the budget which contained two things. First, it advocated the readjustment and extension of the income tax, to bear more heavily on unearned increment, and then it suggested the increase of excise and other taxes on luxuries. Now, for two years the minister has sat on the other side of the house and watched his principles trampled to the ground without