

The Acting Prime Minister said this afternoon that the farmers would not be misled by this resolution; they would know that some political motive was behind it. When the farmers have not had a prosperous year, members of this House receive telegrams from them. I have received over one hundred, and I shall read a few of them from different districts; the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) and the member for Strathcona (Mr. Douglas) will see that I am distributing them pretty well. I will give to the House only a few samples, marking the different corners of the district. The opinions expressed are very similar and they will, perhaps, go to show the unrest that exists amongst the farmers of this country as well as their sincerity in regard to this tariff question. I do not think any hon. member, the Acting Prime Minister included, will say that these men are sending these telegrams in order to make political capital. I do not think the men who sent them ever marked any ballots for me. This is a telegram from Bawlf in the Strathcona Riding:

Bawlf Local of U.F.A. request you as federal member for Victoria constituency to stand resolutely for downward revision tariff along lines proposed in farmers' platform being essential for more production.

Yours respectfully,
(Signed) R. C. Reinhard.

Bawlf is in the northern end of the district. I have here a telegram from a district which, at one time, had the honour to be represented by the eloquent member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). This is from Forestburg, and is signed by Mr. A. Mallett, secretary, Forestburg local:

Forestburg Local U.F.A. sends the following resolution: Be it resolved that the Government of Canada be requested to make substantial reductions in the tariff for imports into Canada.

Forestburg is in the southern end of the district. I have here another telegram from Sedgewick. I might say in passing that out of 200 votes in this section I received seven or eight, so that the gentleman who sent this telegram is not very likely to be a supporter of mine. This telegram reads:

The members of Sedgwick U.F.A. respectfully urge downward tariff revision outlined by farmers' platform proposed by Council of Agriculture and endorsed by provincial farmers' convention this request based on grounds of common fairness to great body of people unjustly burdened by excessive cost of production in basic industry.

I have altogether a little over 100 of these telegrams, all couched in pretty nearly the same language. It seems apparent, there-

[Mr. W. H. White.]

fore, that it is not only the Liberals in this House who are anxious to see some change in the tariff, but the farmers of Canada as well; and when the position is this, that the people of one town in Ontario are producing more, getting more revenue, making more money than all the farmers of the West, it is time for the Government to wake up and look into the matter, in order to see whether some remedy cannot be found for such a condition of affairs. No better land can be found than that in the West; the climate is good and the people are optimistic, and perhaps work harder than any other body of people in Canada, and yet they find they cannot make much money. My opinion is that heavy taxation is the cause of the lack of success in the West. The statement will be made that the people of the West are rich, but I have been a member of this House for ten years and since I have been in this House, I think the Government, on four or five occasions, had to come to the rescue of the Western farmers by giving them seed grain. If they were prosperous they would not require assistance from the Government. It shows how close they are sailing to the wind when one bad crop will compel them to appeal to the Government for aid. I do not think such a thing has happened in any of the older provinces, but when we hear it stated that everybody in the West is making money, why is it that every time there is a crop failure in the West the Government has to render aid? This is a serious question. The Government surely do not understand the real conditions in the West, because if they do, they have a great deal to answer for. There must be something wrong in that country when people who have managed a \$50,000 plant for a number of years cannot make an income of over \$2,000 and come under the income tax. The people of the West have also the geographical position of the country to contend against. Up to the beginning of the war, the average price of oats was 25 cents a bushel, or 35 cents at the lake front. Let us take these prices, and we cannot expect any higher prices now that the war is over. As transportation costs 12 cents a bushel, that leaves 23 cents. It costs ten cents for threshing, so much to bind the grain and so much to till the land. Therefore, if you make a calculation, you will find that 200 acres of land will bring less than \$2,000.

An hon. gentleman from Ontario, a manufacturer, I think, laughs at the idea that the farmers are bearing their share of the