

been saved and the relief would have been distributed more evenly. In Canada there are cities in which a sum of \$48, \$49 or \$50 per month is given to a family of five. There are others where \$10 or \$11 per month is given to a similar family. At other places in the country the prevailing rate for a family is \$8 or \$10.

The constituency which I represent borders for two hundred miles on Saskatchewan, and year after year I have pointed out to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gordon) that there was a great difference in the way in which relief was administered in those two adjoining provinces; that whereas it seemed to be fairly easy in Saskatchewan to get relief, yet right across the border where the same climatic conditions prevailed it was extremely difficult for the most deserving to secure relief because of the difference in the manner of administration. Probably there is as much money as ever in Canada, but most certainly that money is not in the hands of the people who need food, clothing and shelter, not in the hands of those who need furniture, equipment and farm machinery, and for that reason the purchasing power of our people is at a very low ebb.

I wish to discuss briefly a few methods by which I think the purchasing power of the country could be improved. First of all I will deal with tariffs. In 1930 the present government seemed to think high tariffs were the panacea for all our troubles, and duties were raised as may be indicated by the following examples:

Commodity—	Increase	
	From Per cent	To Per cent
Cotton print. . . . .	19	34
Flannelettes. . . . .	16	33
Agricultural implements. . . . .	7	25
Blankets. . . . .	21	50
		(nearly)

These high tariffs have not solved our problem and nothing is clearer recognition of that than the course the government has pursued in bringing down this budget. During recent months economists have spoken and written much; there has been chaos and little agreement on anything, but there is one point on which they are all agreed, namely that budgeting for scarcity will not solve our problem. All agree that economic nationalism and high tariffs will not cure the present depression.

The last speaker, the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser), said that tariffs would fight for the farmers of this country. I want to give at least one illustration by way of showing the extent to which a class of people are benefiting by high tariffs but dodging

their obligations. In 1932 I had the honour of moving in this house a resolution calling upon the government to investigate and support the sugar beet industry in Canada. They were kind enough to send that resolution to a committee and the subject was investigated. The report that was brought in ends thus:

Your committee further recommends that if no successful attempt is made in the immediate future by the refineries to increase the facilities for the manufacture of beet sugar, the government will take into consideration means to accomplish this end.

Since then we have had hard times. One factory has signified its intention to build another branch in southern Alberta, but the government has taken no steps to enforce the findings of the committee. I claim that in Canada there is much room for the expansion of this industry. In 1933 the consumption of sugar in Canada was 871,590,054 pounds and of that only 131,000,000 was made from home grown raw material. While Great Britain and the United States manufacture around twenty per cent of their requirements from home grown raw material, we in Canada, a strictly agricultural country, make only fifteen per cent. So there is great potentiality for expansion of this industry. For instance, one factory in Canada, manufacturing only five per cent of the sugar consumed, employs 350 men in the factory, 2,200 workers in the fields, and 700 growers. So as a means of helping employment, because of its advantage in the rotation of crops, the help it would give to the transportation industry and to the live stock industry through the use of the tops and the pulp, the quantities of fuel, lumber and lime that would be required, and the benefit to the irrigated districts, this industry should receive more consideration. It has great potentialities for good in the economic life of the country.

As showing the fall in the consumption of sugar I may say that in 1930 each man, woman and child in Canada consumed 97.83 pounds; in 1931, 96.77 pounds; in 1932, 90.51 pounds, and in 1933, 80.47 pounds.

One other means that could be adopted in order to increase purchasing power would be an adjustment of exchange rates. Here I would point out that the primary producers of this country have been impoverished by adverse exchange rates during the last few years. When Great Britain went off the gold standard Canada did not follow, and the result has been that during all those years the British pound in Canada has been worth \$3.60, \$3.80, \$4 and up to \$4.87, whereas in the countries that compete with us in