

in such large numbers, it is useless to talk very much about immigration.

May I deal for a moment, not with immigration, but with emigration, and some of the causes that have contributed thereto? There should be no tax in this country on woollen clothing, which is a necessity in a climate such as ours. Yet we find that clothing and blankets are taxed as high as 35 per cent under the general tariff, and from 20 to 25 per cent under the British preference. That is little short of a crime in a climate such as ours. We find that boots and shoes are taxed from 20 to 30 per cent. Take the case of a farmer with a large family, situated two or three miles from school—the average distance in western Canada being two miles. Consider the difficulty this man has in trying to clothe his family to withstand the rigours of the Canadian winter in the face of these taxes; and the figures I have quoted do not tell of all the taxes that the farmer has to pay, because the tariff tax is added at the factory, and the factory price increases something like 100 per cent by the time the product reaches the consumer through the ordinary channels of distribution. Therefore, the consumer pays about double the amount of the tariff tax quoted in the schedule. Can we conceive of anything that would tend more to drive men out of this country than the hardship this man's family is forced to endure under these conditions? I maintain that the tariff tax on woollen clothing has done more to drive people out of this country than any other single factor. The whole tax on necessary clothing and boots and shoes should be wiped out in the interests of humanity and in the interests of common sense. A tax on woollen goods might be all right in Florida, but it is decidedly poor business in Canada. The Canadian people voted overwhelmingly at the last election for low tariff, and I submit that they are in no mood to be trifled with. The government should start their reductions at once, and start them on the great necessities—cotton and woollen goods, and boots and shoes.

I have followed with interest the statements of those who suggest mixed farming as a remedy for our economic ills. Many of those who advocate such a policy however overlook the fact that the problem of mixed farming is inseparably bound up with the problem of wider markets. Take the livestock industry for example. In the Winnipeg stockyards last fall cattle sold for as low as 4½ cents a pound for prime steers, and one cent a pound for fairly good cows in an unfinished condition. In the city of Winnipeg also, potatoes sold for as low as 20 cents a

bushel. The American tariff practically prohibits the shipment of these products to the United States. Now, in view of these facts, to suggest a wholesale reversal from grain to mixed farming is simply adding insult to injury. Furthermore it is well known that thousands of farmers in this country are prevented from keeping hogs and sheep because of the tax on woven wire fencing which, through the medium of tariff and sales tax approximates 25 per cent. I say that the whole problem of mixed farming is inseparably bound up with the problem of wider markets. If you will give us markets and reduce our cost of production, there will practically be no limit to Canada's capacity to produce farm products. Better trading and better international conditions go hand in hand. International commerce tends to bring about a better feeling among all nations. Every satisfied customer that Canada has in foreign countries constitutes a bond of peace between us and those countries; and I think the idea of a bond of peace can be applied also to Canada in a national sense as well as internationally. If the manufacturer in eastern Canada felt that he was getting the farmer's products at their real market value and if, on the other hand, the farmer felt that he was getting the products of the manufacturer at their value in the markets of the world, it would result in creating a bond between them which would make for national solidarity—a bond, Mr. Speaker, which would strengthen the chain forged by the Fathers of Confederation, which is now gradually weakening.

Mr. I. H. MARTELL (Hants): It was not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to intervene in this debate, but in the course of the discussion things have transpired which have made me feel that it is my duty, representing as I do an agricultural constituency in the province of Nova Scotia, to say a few words from the standpoint of a member from the Maritime provinces. It is customary, I believe, to extend congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address. I am sure that while I am a young parliamentarian I can do that with a great deal of gratification. Particularly do I feel that I have the right to congratulate my next door neighbour in the political arena in the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam), in the course of his very excellent disquisition, paid a tribute to the honour that was bestowed upon his constituency by his being selected to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and as a Nova Scotian I sincerely congratulate my col-