

duty which the lawyer has paid on the limousine which he uses for his own pleasure. My statement would not be complete if I left it there. If the doctor employs the lawyer, the cost of the service to the doctor is borne by the doctor himself only until his next visit to the farmer. When he makes that visit he shoulders it upon the farmer. Again, if the doctor and the lawyer perform a service for the manufacturer of agricultural machinery, that individual passes it on to the agriculturist in the price charged for the implement needed on the farm.

Now, I want to tell hon. gentlemen that a fiscal policy such as ours can survive only so long as there is a basic industry to prey upon, and in this case agriculture is the basic industry which has to shoulder the whole thing.

Mr. CAHAN: In what respect is it more basic than fishing or mining?

Mr. EVANS: It may be said that fishing is a basic industry, but from the national standpoint it is inconsiderable compared to agriculture. The worst part of the whole thing is that this tariff policy is destroying the basic industry itself, and that is why agriculture is feeling the pinch to-day. If our protectionist friends here think they can everlastingly go on increasing protection, they must satisfy themselves that there is some basic industry sufficiently prosperous to carry the load.

Mr. CAHAN: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that agriculture, or wheat-growing, because that is the department of agriculture which he is speaking about—

Mr. EVANS: No.

Mr. BIRD: That is a mistake.

Mr. CAHAN: He said wheat-growing.

Mr. EVANS: No.

Mr. CAHAN: Well, take all the departments of agriculture that you like, does the hon. gentleman mean to say that agriculture in this country sustains our nine million people in their various endeavours?

Mr. EVANS: It does, with the exception of some minor industries. And some more wealth is created out of raw material being manufactured into the finished article. But when our protectionist friends have a fiscal policy which takes out of the pockets of the people even more than the wages paid in that industry, I submit there is no benefit to the nation.

Mr. CAHAN: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the man who builds a house out
[Mr. Foster.]

of timber of the value of \$5,000 does not contribute exactly as much to the wealth of the country as the farmer who contributes \$5,000 worth of wheat?

Mr. BIRD: He is not protected.

Mr. EVANS: That man will contribute to the extent that the house afterwards is used to house some one engaged in an industry that brings in new wealth, and only such.

Mr. CAHAN: Is there an industry in this or any other country that does not in its operation bring in new wealth?

Mr. EVANS: I say there is. Most of the industries established in Canada have been a detriment to the progress of the country rather than a benefit.

Mr. CAHAN: That is not my question. Is there an industry which does not produce wealth? I should like to hear of such an industry if it does exist.

An hon. MEMBER: The liquor industry.

Mr. CAHAN: From recent returns that industry apparently produces more wealth than the basic industry of agriculture.

Mr. EVANS: If there is an industry in this country standing on its own feet, then that industry must contribute to its own upkeep; but the very idea of protection precludes any profit-making or any increase in new wealth; and industry in Canada to-day is based on this fact, that it cannot live without protection. Our protectionist friends say that it cannot. Then the value of the finished article must be worth less than the elements entering into its manufacture and the labour that has been put on it. Neither the member for St. Lawrence-St. George nor anyone else can gainsay that fact. If it did not need protection, then it would be worth something more than when in the raw state.

Mr. CAHAN: Will the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. EVANS: Half a minute, please. I repeat, once our protectionist friends say that any article cannot live on its own merit and be sold in the markets of the world, they must admit that with the raw material and the labour entering into the manufacture of that article it is worth less when finished than it was before.

Mr. CAHAN: The other evening I called attention to the fact—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.