

We have also talc mines that have been operated steadily for the last 20 years. I believe they are the only talc mines in the Dominion of Canada, and they too have to meet very unfair competition, as the United States duty is 25½ per cent, while our government imposes a duty of 17½ per cent. As a result since the United States raised the duty, the mines have not been running to full capacity. A great many other minerals are affected in the same way. The budget of course puts mining machinery on the free list, but what good is that when the mines are closed down? These mines are closed down as a direct result of this government failing to impose a tariff equal to that imposed by the United States on our Canadian fluorspar. If that duty were imposed the mines certainly would be able to operate, but at present the fact that mining machinery is on the free list will not enable those mines to open up and operate. I believe one of the planks in the government's platform was the encouragement of the development of natural resources, and this is one of the natural resources of our country; but instead of encouraging the development of these resources certainly the policy of the government is to close them down and put them out of business.

Our farmers have to meet very unfair competition as a result of the high tariff wall against their produce, such as butter, cheese, eggs and live stock. When we take into consideration the enormous quantities of farmers' produce brought into this country, surely we will all agree that they have to meet very unfair competition. The chief market for the farmers' produce is the villages, towns and cities of Canada, and these villages, towns and cities are supported very largely by the factories and manufacturing establishments. These depend on the tariff for their prosperity. If the purchasing power of the urban community is doubled the home market of the farmer is also doubled, and if cut in half the home market is also cut in half. The farmers have been told that the tariff is responsible for most of their troubles, and yet after every tariff reduction the condition of the farmer has grown worse. A tariff policy that sends hundreds of thousands of the farmers' best customers out of Canada into the very country that has closed its markets to our agricultural products, and permits \$78,000,000 worth of agricultural products to come into Canada under a very low tariff in competition with our Canadian farmers' produce, cannot be shown to be in the best interests of Canada, or the best interests of our Canadian farmers. These markets belong to the in-

dustrious people of Canada, and they must have a chance to produce profitably and abundantly.

I have nothing to say against our freight rates from the West, but I believe the lowering of the tariff, or free trade would work disastrously to Canada. I do not believe it would work out as they have anticipated. I think the same thing would happen as happened to the fluorspar industry in my district. I believe when our industries are destroyed, as they certainly will be if the present government pursue a policy such as they have intimated—which is alleged to be the death knell of protection—that the powerful organizations of the United States will get together and raise the price, just the same as they have on the fluorspar, and that our farmers will pay just as much for their implements as they did before. I would be in favour—and I am speaking for myself—of doing everything that I could to assist the farmers. I am in favour of the merchant marine being used to further their interests, and I am very much in favour of subsidizing the merchant marine to enable them to carry the produce of the farmer, flour and live stock at very low cost. I think flour especially should be carried at a very low rate so as to encourage the milling of the wheat in Canada and keep the by-products here for the Canadians. I believe this would lower the cost of production and in that way lower the high cost of living.

The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), the other night, spoke about the opposition favouring the big interests. I want to say just a word about the stamp tax. In my opinion, this government have favoured the big interests in connection with the stamp tax. Very soon after they got into power, they fixed the maximum amount of stamp tax at \$2 on cheques from \$5,000 and upwards. This, in my opinion, works to the detriment of our farmers. Most of the farmers deal through their cheese factories and butter factories in amounts under \$5,000, and this tax turns over to the farmer four times on every transaction weekly in the sale of his butter and cheese. But the large broker, who is dealing in amounts of \$10,000, \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000, has to pay a tax of only \$2 on those amounts. In my opinion, that works out in the interest of the big interests of which the hon. member for Pontiac speaks.

I am in hearty accord with the reduction in the sales tax, but I think the government should have gone a good deal further. The sales tax has not been removed from lumber and cement, building materials. If this were