

Mr. TUCKER: There are other things which the farmer has to buy, such as clothing. Right now the Canadian clothing industry says that it has to compete against the clothing industry of Great Britain and it is asking the government to put on tariffs on textiles so that it can stay in business. But the government has refused because they think that if we are to sell our wheat and other commodities abroad, if we start to keep out British goods, then they will buy their wheat elsewhere.

Would the farmers whom you represent be prepared to see the same principle apply to the clothing industry that you ask to have applied in regard to the farmers; that they should be put on a basis of parity so that they can charge for their clothes enough to keep them in business in Canada?

Mr. YOUNG: In reply to Mr. Tucker in regard to farm implements, according to the figures which I have studied in regard to the farm implement industry and the question of farm implement labour, the percentage that is used which enters into the cost of farm machines is falling year by year. Labour is becoming less of a factor in the price of farm implements. It has gone down very considerably in the last five years; and to suggest that the price of farm implements might have to be raised because of any small increase in the cost of living in Canada which is charged in the prices to the farmer, is rather absurd. Protection from whom? Do they need protection from the United States where the standard of living is already considerably higher than it is here?

We suggested three years ago that you should investigate the farm implement industry in this country. I think it needs a thorough investigation. And on this general question, as we pointed out in the brief, long ago the farmers of Canada offered to produce in competition with all the world if they were given free trade. But that has been completely denied to the farmers of Canada. It is true that the tariff was taken off farm implements, but farm implements are not the only things which the farmer has to buy.

Now, coming to your question about the clothing industry, that all ties in with the whole picture. If you are going to have an economy that is regulated in one part in relation to the others, you must take into consideration all the different parts. We are not prepared to admit that the clothing industry requires any more protection than it has at the present time; and if you will take a look at the tariffs, you will see that it already has a very considerable protection.

Mr. TUCKER: I have heard that argument used very much; but it is not true that while the actual labour in the factories turning out the furnished product has gone down, in view of the fact that more and more component parts have been brought in ready to be incorporated into the finished product, is it not true that the entire cost ultimately comes back to the cost of some sort of labour? The amount of the labour cost which goes into the machine is ultimately determined by the cost of labour which produces all parts, the lumber, to get it out of the bush, and to cut it up. The cost of the coal which you use in the factory is determined by the cost of labour at the mines, and of transportation. The cost of your steel is determined by the cost of the labour to mine and fabricate it. Even your taxes are determined by the level of the cost of labour, because you must pay people engaged in working for the government and for the municipalities reasonable pay as compared to people working in industry. So the argument about the small contribution which labour costs makes to the cost of the finished product is an argument that basically is not true. Is that not correct?