

more harmony in this House and through the Dominion, and more prosperity to all.

I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am not thoroughly versed in farming; we cannot all have that pleasure and privilege, but I think it is generally admitted that these new lands now being broken in for the production of grain for export will not, in twenty years, produce so much per acre. If that is so are we not using up too much of the virgin soil of this country in the present generation for the purpose of exporting wheat to foreign countries, when that land may be required in fifty years or more for food for the coming generations? That should be also taken into consideration.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): May I ask the hon. member if he is now enunciating the policy of the Conservative party?

Mr. BAKER: I tried to enunciate the policy of my party before touching this question, but apparently I have not made myself clear. I would not like to take the time of the House in going over it again, but if my hon. friend would do me the honour of coming to my room to-morrow I would be very pleased to have a talk with him on the subject.

As I was saying, this question of the unbalanced production of wheat has to be taken into serious consideration. I hope I have the success of the wheat growing industry as much at heart as any Canadian, but if we should grow no more wheat than we are growing now, and in the meantime work out a policy whereby we could consume a greater amount of our Canadian wheat at home, I think we would be proceeding in the right direction. I have a number of quotations on United States wheat; everyone knows it is inferior in quality to Canadian wheat, but it is quoted sometimes as high as 15 cents a bushel more than the Winnipeg market.

The policy I am advocating for the balancing of trade in this country would give protection to the wheat grower as well as to everyone else; he would receive more money for his wheat, which would benefit everyone. Then again on this question of the over-production of wheat, we must remember Russia; supposing Russia should become sane? She is on the road to sanity now, and what about wheat when she gets back to normal? I read the other day of a shipment of 30,000 tractors from New York to Russia, which were paid for by cash. If the wheat fields of Russia are opened up I presume we cannot produce wheat as cheaply as it can be produced in that country. They are in close proximity

to England, and England will buy where she can get the grain the cheapest; then where shall we find a market for our wheat? The United States will not take it; Russia will be supplying England, and what are we going to do with our hundreds of millions of bushels of surplus production? Why not see that possible trouble ahead and stop now this excess production? Let the grain grower see the true light and start to build up a home market in Canada, looking forward to that possible menace in the future. I call that good business. Do not wait until the trouble comes, and then say: Oh well, we used to send all our wheat to Europe but Russia has the market to-day. And we must remember that there is the Argentine also supplying wheat to the world's market. The standard of living in these competing countries is low compared with ours, and what are you going to do then? The one salvation for the western wheat grower, and he is coming to see it, is to build up a home market in this country, and that is the policy advocated by the Conservative party.

There are many viewpoints of protection, but I would like to give a quotation you have all heard before very often; to my mind it is so good that I do not think anyone can hear it too often or dwell upon it too much. It is a quotation from Abraham Lincoln, and it is good. He was more modest than we are; he did not presume to know very much about protection. He said:

I do not know much about tariffs, but I do know this much: When we buy goods from a foreign country, we get the goods and the foreigner gets the money; but when we buy goods at home, we get both the goods and the money.

I think it would be a good thing to have that framed as a motto and sent all over the country to be hung on every man's wall. There are other people that have ideas on protection, for example the Prime Minister. He gave utterances to some of those ideas in this House on April 30th, 1925, as reported at page 2656 of revised Hansard. The Prime Minister said on that occasion that what the country needs is protection for the women. Well, to that extent I agree with him. But when he talks about his knowledge of protection for women he ought to discuss the question a little with some of us grandfathers in this House. We who have mothers, sisters, wives, and married daughters ought to know a little more about protection of women than the Prime Minister does. The right hon. gentleman says there should be protection for women. He is right but the protection the housewife wants is to know that her man is going to have a job and whether he is going