

borough the other day, apparently without much effect, was much more severe on the Farmers' party than was even the Prime Minister. He said that the Farmers' party was a menace to the Government. Well, I do not object to that at all. That may be quite true; and it might be a good thing for the country. But he went on to say that the Farmers' party was a menace to the Dominion of Canada. I say that the man who makes statements of that kind does not know what he is talking about. I would ask any honourable gentleman in this House to point to a single case where the men who live on the land, who work and make a living for themselves and their families out of the soil, have ever been a menace to any country. Where do our cities recruit from? From the boys on the farm. I venture to say that if you went to the chief politicians, statesmen, bankers, manufacturers, and merchants, and asked the head men where they spent the first twenty years of their lives, the great majority of them would answer, "On the farm in such-and-such a part of Canada." They are not the men who are or ever will be a menace to Canada. The farmers of Canada to-day are the most conservative people in the Dominion of Canada. Why would they not be conservative? They have the biggest stake of any class of men in the Dominion of Canada. Any one who would like to see a change of Government brought about, who would like to see this Government put out and a Farmers' Government brought in, need not complain of the statements or actions of the right honourable the Prime Minister or the honourable the Minister of Militia. Such statements as those made by those two gentlemen never make a vote for them; on the contrary, they do more to make votes against them than almost any other course they could take. I am glad to say that my right honourable friend the Prime Minister has toned down marvellously since then. He is young, and quicker to learn a lesson than we old fellows; and, if you will notice, he now speaks with a great deal more consideration and respect for the Farmers' party.

Now, I want to deal for a short time with the tariff. My honourable friend the leader of the House went into that question very fully and very strongly, and he waxed very wroth that any one should have the temerity to suggest that the tariff might be lowered or should not be increased. Among other things he said that we are likely to find the Fordney Bill in force in the United States. Personally, honourable

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF.

gentlemen, I do not think that the Fordney Bill is likely to go into force—it may; I don't know; but I think it more likely, if it passes Congress during the next few days, that President Wilson will veto it, and I do not think there will be enough votes to carry it over his veto; and by the time the Harding Administration will be in the saddle, I think the better sense of the people of the United States will begin to assert itself.

The United States is a great manufacturing nation. What are the people of that country up against now? They are up against the high cost of living and high labour. How could they hope to bring down the cost of living if they put an almost impassable barrier to food products going from Canada into the United States? But for the purposes of argument let us suppose that the Fordney Bill comes into force, and then let us see where we are. I want to say, honourable gentlemen, that, practically, the Fordney Bill was in force in the United States prior to 1911. At that time we had the McKinley tariff, under which for every bushel of wheat sent to the United States 25 cents was paid in duty; for every bushel of flax 30 cents was paid; for every bushel of oats 12 cents; and as to barley, I am not sure from memory, but I think it was 15 cents.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: Twenty cents.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: Twenty cents on every bushel of barley. We paid through the nose on every head of cattle, every sheep or lamb, and every hog that went into the United States. My honourable friend the leader of the House is mistaken when he says a Bill of that kind will keep those goods out altogether. Under those conditions we sent many millions of dollars worth of them into the United States—Why? Because the people of the United States wanted food, and had the money to pay for it, and they paid the farmers' price, and the duties besides, to get that food. Do you know, honourable gentlemen, that in the United States they cannot make the satisfactory grade of flour which they want without the hard wheat of the prairie provinces—with the exception of some that they have in Minnesota and North Dakota—which they mix in the proportion of 1 bushel to 4 of their soft wheat.

We do not want the Fordney Bill. Our farmers in the West, and I have no doubt the farmers of Ontario—although I am not speaking for Ontario, as I do not know conditions there as well—profited