Hall and the Hart House string quartet with them. He was in a gloomy mood when he spoke on that occasion, and he concluded with this bit of verse:

> Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
> Where free trade flourishes and men decay.

He affirmed his belief in the Bible, but he said, "I have no belief in either Exodus or Lamentations." That was the situation in 1924, but happily what he feared did not come about; his fears did not materialize. But in 1930 he was the supporter of a government that created for him a condition which brought to realization his fondest hopes. It gave him protection to the *n*th degree, and then from 1930 to 1935 we had an exodus of employees from the factories of this country, an exodus from the payrolls, and throughout the length and breadth of the land there were lamentations. At that time, in 1924, Mr. Massey confirmed what had been done. He said that he was perfectly satisfied with the reductions in the duty and that, as far as the Massey-Harris Company was concerned—and he said no doubt this would apply to other implement companies—there would be passed on to the farmers by way of reduced prices the complete saving effected by the remission of the sales tax and the lessened duties on raw material. The farmers of this country expect the implement industry to do now what was done in 1924.

In the most eloquent terms the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Massey) followed the practice of Conservative members during this session and deplored the reduction of any duties because of the effect that would have on industrial workers. He feared for their financial future. He was in favour of a high tariff and a monopoly for the benefit of the industrial workers. The names Massey and Cockshutt have been associated with the implement industry for generations, and I hope the hon. member will not take offence when I say that in the mind of the agricultural population the names Massey and Cockshutt have been associated with great wealth, accumulated in the farm implement industry. Therefore, when they speak of colossal losses so far as agricultural implements are concerned, it is difficult to understand, particularly where the Massey-Harris Company is involved. At page 63 of the report of the price spreads commission it is stated that in the years 1927, 1928 and 1929 the agricultural implement companies made $16,000,000, while in the years 1930 to 1934 they lost $11,000,000. The report goes on to state that their method of doing business since 1929 was an "inflexibility in price" and "a flexibility in production." There is just one expression appearing on page 62 of that report to which I should like to refer, because it sums up the situation pretty well:

> The result has been that the farmer, the industry's sole customer, whose income has been drastically reduced through the falling prices of primary products, and who has relatively little bargaining power, has been compelled to pay what he regards as high prices to a monopolistic manufacturing group for the essential tools of his trade, at a time when he could least afford it.

At page 66 the price spreads committee also state that there is no competition in price so far as the farm implement industry is concerned. There may be some competition in the matter of service, as to parts and in salesmanship, but the managements have seen to it that the price has been maintained. The viewpoint of the farmer is pretty well summed up at page 298 of the report, and I think this is well worth placing on Hansard because it comes from a man who, by reason of his clear-headed thinking during the progress of that inquiry, made himself a national figure. I refer to Mr. Ed. Young, who said:

> The implement manufacturers made a mistake many years ago when they joined the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in support of a fiscal policy calculated to exploit the only customers they had. Now that the exploitation is complete they find themselves without customers. Had they joined the farmers' associations in their fight against tariffs they might have created a saner sentiment in regard to these matters throughout the country and perhaps have saved us from some of the extreme tariff rates we now endure, and which have been the major factor in rendering the farmer unable to buy the implements he needs.

I have said that there was no competition. This report also indicates that the difference between the cash and credit price to the farmer is about fifteen per cent. It is also stated that in 1927, without the importation of agricultural implements to the tune of nearly $20,000,000, the production in Canada would not have been sufficient to take care of the export and domestic trade. Prior to the war the Massey-Harris Company devoted sixty per cent of their production to export trade, and this report indicates that since the war they have exported between sixty and eighty per cent of their production. It does seem to me that the Massey-Harris Company and other similar organizations are suffering to-day from loss of markets, particularly the loss of that export market due to the very conditions—increased tariffs—which they would perpetuate in this country. It appears to me that as a result of high tariffs the consumer pays more to a monopoly. He pays more to enable that monopoly to produce goods of which a large part find their way to the export