

The Budget—Mr. Evans

home consumption in a retail way". The farmers of Canada have repeatedly tried to lower their cost of production by buying at first cost. When they could not do this in Canada there was nothing for it but to import. They have been met at every turn with the dumping act, and because they are not recognized under the rules of combine as jobbers or dealers they are by law denied the right to purchase except at retail prices. I have here a lettergram from one of my constituents who was assessed under the dumping act a large sum of money because it was charged that he had imported too cheaply some goods that had gone out of style in the country of origin. Just fancy our tariff board at the instigation of the manufacturers dictating to us what we shall wear, and what we should not wear.

Mr. McMASTER: That should be left to the Minister of Customs.

Mr. SALES: It should not be left to anybody.

Mr. EVANS: Again let me say that I always thought the sales tax was a percentage on the transaction, but here again discrimination is practised, and the same lettergram states that the import sales tax favours the wholesale importer as against the retail importer. I think this is a state of affairs, when taken altogether, that is unbearable to a free people if they know the conditions. This country is in a position to-day of having a combination of politicians and privileged interests which have been formed, and they together have agreed that the cost of living shall not be lowered; in fact they have the power to-day to say what the standard of living shall be. The dumping act is a piece of legislation dictated by greed, with the one idea of creating a monopoly to control everything as to price which our people need to buy. It is slavery. I have made the statement that the dumping act as administered is arbitrary and tyrannical in its application. Not long ago a gentleman was sent all the way from Nelson, B.C. to Winnipeg to assess two cars of apples. These apples were of a class and kind not grown in Canada; but is it reasonable to bring a man 1,200 miles to assess a car of apples? I suppose if someone in Saskatoon happens to get a car of apricots next season too cheaply according to their idea, a man from Niagara will have to be sent up there to adjust it.

Mr. McMASTER: Were they Northern Spies?

[Mr. Evans.]

Mr. EVANS: No. I suppose if Vancouver gets a consignment of cotton from Great Britain at a price below what the Minister of Customs will consider a fair market value for home consumption, at the instigation of a representative, say, of Dominion Cottons Limited, somebody from Montreal will have to go 4,000 miles to adjust the duty. Is this the way to collect revenue? I think it is time the common people of this country inquired who Canada belongs to anyway, and for whose sake and for whose benefit its affairs are administered. Is the purchasing power of our earnings to be determined by the Minister of Customs with all these privileged interests at his elbow? The people of the prairies have to do without many things. They have to do without fruit to the detriment of their health because of the present protection. It is not too much to say that British Columbia could have found a sale for 1,000 cars of apples more on the prairies had the price been in line with the price of what we have to sell; and that would have been the case but for the duty and the arbitrary application of the dumping act. It is a sorry plight to which any country can be brought when the manufacturers and producers can set the price of their product, and have their exploiting tendencies recognized in the legislation of the land. This letter from the Western Canada Jobbers' Association has the following to say regarding this matter:

The fair market value this year, for home consumption in the United States, as set by the growers in British Columbia on C. grade apples, was \$1.10, and the jobbers were assessed 15 per cent on \$1.10 because the apples purchased in the United States were purchased at a price which was more than 15 per cent below \$1.10. If it can be proven that United States growers are selling for export to Canada at a lower price than for home consumption, then probably our industry should be protected. But we could buy good apples in Washington for 80 cents which was the price at which they were sold in the United States. Why pay dumping duty because the British Columbia growers claim that the growers in the United States should be getting \$1.10.

I always thought that the meaning of dumping was that they were being sold for export at a cheaper rate than they were being sold at home. This is not the case, and yet the dumping act is being applied. Again this bears out the assertion I have already made.

In Washington the cost of packing a box of apples is figured at 42 cents, everything included, while in British Columbia they figure their cost up to nearly 80 cents.

The trouble with the British Columbia apple grower is the same as with the manufacturer. By protection the cost of doing anything is driven altogether out of line. Relations between the British Columbia apple