

It is for these reasons that I protest against this price of 70 cents. Of course, when that petition came in, the people were for the most part thinking of 60-cent wheat. It is for these reasons that I oppose this bill.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern): In dealing with the bills now before us relating to agriculture, we must bear in mind three considerations which to a certain extent appear to have been lost sight of in the speeches that have been made in opposition to the particular bill at present before the house. The first consideration is that there seems to be an idea on the part of many hon. members who have taken part in this debate that in some way we in western Canada who are supporting the government in this legislation contend that it will remedy the unfairness, the disabilities, under which western Canada has suffered owing to tariff policy and monetary policy in the past. It seems quite clear to me from the speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) that he did not contend that this legislation was intended to compensate western Canada for the disabilities under which it suffers on account of the tariff policy of this country. Indeed, it would be rather strange for anyone to suggest that these disabilities could or would or should be cured by two bills brought in by the Minister of Agriculture. And when our friends of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and the Social Credit group attack these bills because they are not adequate compensation for all the disabilities under which we suffer, it appears to me that they are not touching the main problem now before us, namely, whether these bills are good bills and should be supported.

I intend to deal with these matters only in outline, Mr. Speaker. First, in regard to the tariff; I do not believe any thinking person or any thinking economist would doubt that we in western Canada suffer terribly under the tariff policy of this country. Not only do we have to sell in the markets of the world, without any protection whatever, in competition with the lowest paid farmers throughout the world; we even have to meet the competition of subsidized farming in certain parts of the world. Further, as though that were not enough, an extra burden is put upon our backs by virtue of a tariff policy which enables prices to be charged higher than we would have to pay if it were not for that tariff wall and, in the second place and more important still, it enables cartels and combines to be set up behind that wall which fix prices regardless of competition.

[Mr. Needham.]

Before the Rowell commission certain figures as to the extent the west suffers owing to the protective tariff were given which had been prepared by the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Rogers), on behalf of the government of Nova Scotia in connection with another inquiry. Experts were engaged by the government of Manitoba, among them Professor Viner, an outstanding economist of one of the United States universities, to examine the claim put forward by the government of Ontario that there was little substance in the minister's claims, and after the most exhaustive examination Professor Viner came to the conclusion that the net annual loss to the three prairie provinces because of the protective tariff policy was at least \$47,000,000 a year. Does anyone suggest that by two or three bills brought in by the Minister of Agriculture this whole set-up can be changed and the west compensated for its losses; and that if they do not do so they should be defeated even though beneficial bills.

There is no doubt in my mind, that one of the causes of the present situation in Europe has been the attitude after the war in regard to trade, of the United States particularly, and of Canada in somewhat less degree. Before the war Germany paid for her necessary imports of food products and raw materials by means of manufactured goods to the extent of 85 per cent, and by way of services, such as were rendered by her merchant marine, to the extent of 15 per cent. Then, by virtue of the fact that we took away her merchant marine, we made it impossible for her to render those services which paid for 15 per cent of her imports. So, in order to feed her people and keep together her industrial organizations, she had to step up her exports to the extent of another 15 per cent. I need not go into the question of reparations, which were also demanded and could only be paid ultimately by increased exports. What was the attitude of the rest of the world? Tariffs were raised, first by the United States in 1920. Tariffs against Germany went up all over the world, preventing her from paying by means of manufactured articles for the foodstuffs she required. What was Germany to do? Unemployment was increasing; her people were on the verge of starvation. She did the only thing she could. First of all, she strictly organized her people in order to try to carry on under that set-up. Then, in accordance with the fixed principle that people will fight rather than starve, Germany began to take the attitude that if the nations of the world would not trade with her and enable her to procure