

anyone would be glad to wear. I have them in my hand. I showed these socks to the people and I explained to them that the duty on these under Liberal rule was 35 per cent, because the Liberals believed that the rich man should pay more than the poor man, but that under the present administration the duty on these socks had been increased to 51 per cent. At a special session of parliament, called to relieve distress, to relieve unemployment, my right hon. friend increases the duty on the sock of the poor man or the unemployed to 165 and 185 per cent, but on his own sock he is satisfied with 51 per cent. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) a little while ago pointed out that certain socks were off the market because of that duty. A friend of mine, belonging to the wool producers of Saskatchewan, went into their office in Regina the other day and asked for a price on four-point Hudson Bay blankets, which are the best blanket you can get. The dealer said: "I can give you at a reasonable price some four-point Hudson Bay blankets that have been carried over from last year." My friend said that he wanted new blankets. The dealer replied: "There is no new stock; we are not handling them any more; with the present tariff we cannot handle them any more." The man said: "Do you mean to tell me I can no longer buy four-point Hudson Bay blankets?" The dealer replied: "On account of the present duties imposed by the present government it is impossible to sell those blankets any more in this country." Because of that duty the people of Canada are to-day compelled to adopt a lower standard of living by buying inferior blankets.

Mr. McGIBBON: Does the hon. member not know that most of these Hudson Bay blankets are made in Canada, some in my own town?

Mr. YOUNG: I am not speaking of where they are made.

Mr. McGIBBON: If they are made in Canada, how can there be any duty on them?

Mr. YOUNG: There is the answer to the government's contention. The blankets are made in Canada and the price has gone up.

The Prime Minister also said that he would not listen to any such speeches as I made during the short session. That is very much like a statement he made the other day when Mr. R. J. Deachman, representative of the consumers' league, appeared before a committee of the cabinet at the request of the

[Mr. Young.]

Canadian Council of Agriculture to represent the cause of the farmers of this country when the cabinet was considering increasing tariffs. What did the Prime Minister say to him? "We do not want any arguments from you." That is what the Prime Minister said to our representative before the cabinet. That is what he is saying to us in the west, and that is what he said in his speech on Tuesday—"We do not want any arguments from you." What was the matter with the speeches I made last session? Just let us review for a moment what I said then.

One of the first measures, if not the first measure brought in at that session, was a bill authorizing the government to spend \$20,000,000 for the relief of unemployment. As was my duty I arose in my place on that occasion and told the Prime Minister what I thought of his bill. I told him that in my opinion it would not relieve the smallest fraction of unemployment. I tried to explain that the cause of unemployment was that the people had no purchasing power. I tried to explain that before he could spend \$20,000,000 or \$20 on unemployment, he must first take that money out of the pockets of the people. I tried to explain that if he spent \$20,000,000 in one part of the country, creating employment, he would create \$20,000,000 worth of unemployment in other parts of the country where he collected that money; for he would by that very act still further reduce their purchasing power. Was I not right?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. YOUNG: Let us see. The minister's own officers told us at that time that there were two hundred thousand unemployed in Canada. To-day there are three hundred thousand. Has that relieved unemployment? Was I not right?

Further than that, the Prime Minister brought down other measures increasing the tariff enormously, to give employment to Canadian labour and encourage Canadian industry, as he said. Again I tried to explain to him that the cause of the trouble was the lack of purchasing power on the part of the people. I tried to explain to him that in no possible way could he legislate through his tariff to bring about higher prices for the commodities that we had to sell abroad. I tried to explain that the purchasing power of the people could not be restored until a parity was restored between the prices of the goods we had to sell and the prices of the goods we had to buy, and that the only way in which the purchasing power of the people of this country could be increased was by bringing