

cents a pound duty on raisins from all countries except Australia. Now there will be that duty on both butter and raisins, raising still higher the cost of living.

Besides, we tax ourselves to give cheap transportation to Australia and New Zealand for our manufactured goods. This charge again agriculture, the basic industry, has to bear the biggest portion of. That is, the Canadian farmer pays carriage on agricultural implements made in Canada to our own competitors in another land, by steamship subsidies and subventions. The Australian treaty would never have been thought of except to give advantage to manufacturers at the farmer's expense. The duty on butter previous to the treaty did not help the Canadian farmer in any respect, as we were then mostly on an export basis. When it became likely that it could be used to give the farmers an advantage in price, the duty was immediately taken off and the raisin manipulation inaugurated for our tariff-fed manufacturers.

I want to tell the Minister of Finance something which no doubt he already knows. He cannot negotiate a treaty between two highly protected countries like Canada and Australia without placing a burden on one class for the benefit of the other. The Australian treaty from the very first was a class measure for class advantage alone. Our farmers, I believe, have been confused more over the Australian treaty than over anything else. The government had it established before its significance was realized by the people. The Conservative party even before the exit of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen advocated protection for our agriculturists engaged in special lines of agriculture. A great many of our farmers were thereby led astray on this question, being persuaded that immediate benefit could be derived from protection on their particular products. Protection by increasing the cost of production had already reduced our farmers to a point where they could not make ends meet on the farm. Taking advantage of this, protectionists persuaded many farmers that there should be a high duty on butter, and that the Liberals had by the Australian treaty ruined the dairy industry. The truth is that the Australian treaty was only one feature of the game of privilege that had already ruined the small farmer and dairyman, but like a drowning man grasping at a straw many of our farmers grasped at the illusion of a tariff. Even did a duty on butter give for a time a higher price, the farmer in the end would have to bear the cost. Now the treaty is to be

abrogated and one fair to all classes negotiated. Another illusion! If the abolition of the Australian treaty implies protection, it also implies free raisins, or at least the old half-a-cent rate. This was the very foundation, I say again, of the Australian treaty, and the policy of this government is well defined by the fact that there is now to be a duty on butter and raisins which will materially raise the cost of living to the worker. The duty on raisins was imposed to give freer entry in the Australian market to the products of our manufacturers, and the increased duty now imposed on butter is for the benefit of the great creamery and dairy merger lately formed.

One may wonder why the government are able to impose these measures on the public at large, but this wonder ceases when it is realized that every source of information available to the public to-day is controlled by the protected interests of this country. I want to say from my place in the house to-night that for many years past nothing worth while has come from any economic professor in any of our colleges or universities across this dominion. Why is this? Why the absolute silence of those men who are paid to study these questions and to give a lead not only to our politicians and statesmen but also to the public at large? Every magazine and newspaper to-day belongs to these protected interests. Why is it they see it is so necessary to control the sources of information in this way? Why should these measures be imposed upon the people to the extent that wealth is being concentrated more and more each year in the hands of a few people?

I want to give a few figures taken from the Canada Year Book of 1929. The total estimated population of Canada last year was 9,519,220. Of this number only 129,663 had incomes sufficient for income tax, or 1.36 per cent of the whole population. On incomes from \$2,000 up to \$30,000 the income tax paid was \$11,538,950, or 46.54 per cent of all the income tax collected. This was paid by 128,293 persons, or 98.94 per cent of all the income tax payers. On incomes over \$30,000, there was paid \$13,254,448, or 53.46 per cent of the total income tax collected. This was paid by 1,370 persons, or 1.06 per cent of those subject to income tax. These figures go to show the policy we are following is the policy of the concentration of wealth and power. It is time the common people took their politics into their own hands, or that statesmen had some consideration for the workers as well as for those who are already rich.