

it would seem to be wise to pay some attention to this basic industry. I argue that the National Policy is diametrically opposed to the best interests of agriculture.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre argues for a home market for agriculture, and by the same token he argues for a home market for manufactures. The manufacturer, he says, must have protection which will eliminate opposition, but he becomes partial at that point, because the agriculturist has no protection and is made more or less the victim of the protection which is afforded to the manufacturer. The hon. gentleman by his arguments would oblige all governments in Canada to assume the monetary obligation involved in protection in our relations with other countries. That is to say, if Canada has a high protective tariff which has the effect of keeping out the goods of other countries, the task is imposed on the Canadian government of bargaining with other countries to give us favoured nation treaties or access to their markets in other ways. I do not see the logic in that argument.

At this point it may be well to ask, what is a home market? The market is represented by the purchasing power of the agriculturist, of the labouring man and of the professional man. The purchasing power of the agriculturist is limited by the amount he can receive in the market of a free trade world. His products are sold in competition with cheap labour all over the world, with conditions obtaining in other countries where agriculture is carried on. On the other hand our manufacturing friends oppose that principle, claiming that they cannot compete—and they will not if they can avoid it—under conditions which are nevertheless forced upon the agriculturist. The wage earner, the labourer, is circumscribed in the labour markets of the world; he is in competition with labour everywhere. The professional man's purchasing power is circumscribed more or less by the competition of those of his own profession. The total of these represents the purchasing power of Canada or of any other country.

Now, the imposition of a 10 per cent tariff minimizes the purchasing power in the home market to that extent. If you impose a 20 per cent tariff the purchasing power in the home market is limited one-fifth. Consequently the protectionist meets no competition until the purchasing power in the home market has been diminished by that 10 per cent or that one-fifth. The whole purchasing power of the people under a tariff is nullified by the extent of the tariff, be it 10, 15 or 20 per cent—it is nullified and becomes of no effect. The amount of the tariff also represents what the

beneficiaries of the system receive for which they give no adequate return.

If that argument is followed out to its logical conclusion and every country would impose a tariff having the object of keeping out the products of other countries, we would then have Canada for the Canadians, America for the Americans, Great Britain for the British, Germany for the Germans, Russia for the Russians, China for the Chinese, Japan for the Japanese, and so on. So we come back to greatly enhanced prices, to a nullification of the purchasing power of the whole world due to the operations of this impostor, protection. The only benefits they might get are through the extra genius shown by statesmen in the various countries who exact a better bargain than the statesmen of other countries. Now when an individual feels himself a victim of a system or a principle, no amount of argument will soothe him or persuade him that he is not a victim, and in that regard I argue, as I have done frequently in this House, that the agriculturist is justified in feeling that he is a victim, and no amount of talk by our Conservative friends or other advocates of protection in Canada will ever persuade the agriculturist that he is not the victim of a vicious system. I believe that that feeling will remain in his breast just so long as he is denied equity in a country with great natural resources, which should give him a fair return for his labour.

I hold in my hand an article that appeared in the *Journal of Commerce* some time ago, and I am sure our Conservative friends will not dispute the authority of that *Journal*. I wish to present a case to the common people of this Dominion, whether they be agriculturists, professional men, or labourers in our towns and cities or villages, to show the enormity that is practised through this vicious system of protection, and how the masses are victimized for the benefit of a few people. I think that the presentation of these figures will prove conclusively that the beneficiaries of protection are not so much concerned with providing a job for the working man, as in perpetuating this vicious system and taking the benefits that accrue from it—a system that has been followed by all governments in this country since 1878.

The object of this writer was to give to the people of Canada the idea that the tariff is a very small thing, and he purports to give a list of the implements that are necessary on a 160-acre farm. This is the list: gang plow, spike tooth harrow, scuffer, disc harrow, disc drill, spring tooth cultivator, corn cultivator, corn binder, manure spreader, mower, horse rake, binder and wagon. He states that this