

table represents the ordinary equipment for an average farm of 160 acres, and the duty payable on these implements. When my eyes fell upon this article it occurred to me that if the editor of this paper knew no more about the matter than the writer of this article, he might be justified in printing it, but if he did know more, he should have met him at the door with a baseball bat, because he has presented the strongest possible argument in favour of low protection. He has done this unconsciously, because he did not know what he was talking about. He has calculated that \$175.77 will be payable in duty on these implements on the average farm, but he does not give half the implements that are necessary before a man can engage in farming on that scale. In the first place he has no harness, and in passing I would say that I would like nothing better than to have the writer of this article go on a 160-acre farm and try to make a living with the equipment that he has listed as necessary. He would be like a buttercup in the Sahara desert. Nevertheless, this man purports to be an authority on protection. Possibly some sensible people may have seen his ridiculous statement and may believe in it and therefore, I propose to expose the fallacy of it. He has no provision for harness, and hon. gentlemen know that there is quite an extensive duty on harness, and that you cannot do much farming without harness. The implements he has listed require four horses, and he would be obliged to provide harness, to the amount of approximately \$100. He has no walking plough, but as he has furnished a gang plough he can perhaps do without it, although I could not; he has not got a wagon box with which to draw his grain to market and his seed to the field; nor a fanning-mill to clean the grain before taking it to market and to clean the seed before sowing. He has no pickler, and as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) and my Progressive friends know, that is absolutely necessary on account of smut and other things. He has no engine, no ensilage cutter; he has not even a sleigh or a cutter. Evidently he expects that a Chinaman lives on the adjoining farm for he has made no provision for a washing machine or a wringer for the farmer's wife. He has no buggy, forks, shovels, spades, axes, hoes, chains, clevises, no roller or packer, and no thrashing machine. I have made what I think a very fair list of the articles which I think are necessary, and if you take the duty as given by this writer, \$175.77 and add the items I have given, you get a duty of \$375 on the implements the

[Mr. Gould.]

farmer will absolutely require on a 160 acre farm before he can engage in farming. My urban brother in the city is not obliged to pay that tax. Only the man who chooses agriculture as his vocation is obliged to pay this \$375 extra tax over and above what his brother in the urban centre pays, and that is why we cry out against this system of which we are the victims. I may say incidentally that if my words ever reach the ears of this writer, I hope he will mend his ways.

Mr. HOEY: No provision is made for a Ford car?

Mr. GOULD: There is no provision for a Ford car. This writer goes on to say:

Implements at all properly cared for will last on the average in Canada ten years, so that allowing for manufacturers taking every dollar in duty that they can, we have an extra cost per year of \$17.50.

I have shown that that average would be \$37.50, as the tax amounts to \$375. He goes on:

Assuming an annual crop of 100 acres and an average yield of all kinds of grain of 17½ bushels to the acre, this duty would add to the cost of producing the grain one cent a bushel.

That is very generous. We have in Canada at the present time 60,000,000 acres of land under cultivation, and I shall endeavour to show the huge amount of money which the agriculturist is obliged to pay before he can engage in farming. Sixty million acres under cultivation means 375,000 quarter sections of land. Taking the writer's own computation of \$375, that means a total fine of \$140,425,000 which is placed on the agriculturist of Canada before he can engage in his chosen occupation. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that when the people become aware of these things they protest and they send representatives to parliament to register their protest. As I have already stated every election in the past has been fought upon economic issues and the same issues will come up at every election in the future until justice is done to the people that suffer from this system.

The writer also argues that the charge in question will have to be renewed every ten years. That is to say that this huge expenditure of \$140,425,000 is repeated every ten years. If we take that for forty-five years it means a total payment in the way of penalty of \$631,912,500. That is what those sixty million acres will pay in the course of forty-five years. This is a huge sum to be taken out of the pockets of one class of the community. Is it any wonder, as I stated a few moments ago that the manufacturers, the beneficiaries of this system, are not as anxious