

for the protection of sixteen cents a pound the five large producers in our district during the last two years would have been out of business, for the simple reason that the industry to the south of the line has been in a distressed condition. Producers who have been able to sell at all—a large number are still holding their crop—have been selling hops at as low as seven and a half to nine cents a pound. What that really means is this: It costs the grower in British Columbia one and three-quarter cents a pound to pick the green hops, and it takes four pounds of green hops to make one pound of dry, so that it will be seen that the price at which the product was sold south of the line did not amount to more than the mere cost of picking. I know of one case in Washington that was drawn to my attention recently. This grower was operating forty acres and he paid out fourteen and a half cents cash for every pound of hops produced last year. This did not include his family's labour, rental, depreciation, interest, storage and other charges, and that crop of course would have been sold at half that price.

Mr. DUNNING: That is not in Canada?

Mr. BARBER: That is in the state of Washington. In Canada the cost of production is a great deal higher. I think that if this matter were investigated by the tariff board, as it should be, the minister would find that cost of production will vary up to twenty-four cents a pound. With a protection of only ten cents a pound and 7½ cents a pound, under distressed conditions such as have obtained in the last two years one can imagine what would happen to the industry in Canada. I know representations have been made to the minister from perhaps one grower, because in the last three or four years the matter has come to my attention when I have brought it to the notice of parliament and the government. This particular grower insists that the tariff should be completely removed. Upon investigation the minister would find that this person is more of a dealer than a grower. He has sold every pound of foreign hops that have been sold in Canada in the last four or five years.

Mr. DUNNING: I have no such representations as have been mentioned by the hon. member.

Mr. BARBER: Those representations were made prior to 1930.

Mr. DUNNING: I have no such representations.

Mr. BENNETT: This matter did not go to the tariff board.

Mr. BARBER: I suggest that it was only a question of the minister running through the schedule and picking out something to add to the list of which the government is boasting. They talk about placing commodities on the free list, and so on. I suggest that the minister just ran through the list and picked out hops.

Mr. DUNNING: I am sorry the hon. member thinks that.

Mr. BARBER: A few nights ago the minister said something about reducing the burden of the tariff. In this instance what does the burden amount to? One pound of hops is used in one barrel of beer. He is reducing the burden of the tariff on the brewers, the most highly protected people in Canada. There is not much burden there, even if the rate were ten cents. If it were ten cents more it would not be too much. A reduction to ten cents a pound is not reducing the burden to a very great extent on a barrel of beer. Prior to the budget being brought down I indicated to the minister that before any action was taken with regard to hops the matter should be investigated by the tariff board. The hop growers are prepared to come before the board, and I suggest that would be the proper procedure. I will go so far as to say that if he will make some arrangements whereby the brewers would take the Canadian product, he can remove the tariff completely.

Probably he will recall that prior to 1930 this matter was brought to the attention of the government and placed before the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) and other members of the government. I believe at that time some effort was made, but no agreement resulted. The only remedy was to take action through the tariff. If the minister could enter into an agreement whereby the production of Canadian hop growers would be used by brewers, the growers would not be greatly interested in the tariff.

Mr. BENNETT: At whose instance was this reduction made in the tariff.

Mr. DUNNING: At the instance of the brewers who use the hops, and who presented all sorts of evidence, in many cases from growers. It is not from a single grower.

Mr. BARBER: One grower.

Mr. DUNNING: No, not from a single grower. In connection with this item I had the curious experience of having representations against it which were afterwards specifically withdrawn by representatives of