

it would be to their particular advantage to eat a little of the protectionist pie, but in this respect I think the farmers would do well to take warning from what has happened to the farmers on the other side of the line.

In the United States protection has been carried to ridiculous extremes. The farmer has been told that protection would be a benefit to him and he has been given protection on all his products. If there is any country in the world where protection would benefit the farmer it is the United States, because there he has such an enormous home market of his own. The farmer fell for that argument and voted for protection, and what has been the result? The farmer of the United States to-day is in a far more pitiable plight than any other farmer of whom I know; he finds himself in this position, that no matter what price he receives for his products his production costs are always just a little higher. He is like the ox in the treadmill, forever climbing but never ascending; or like the ancient Tantalus, dying of thirst with water all around him or starving to death with food in abundance just beyond his reach.

I have here a copy of *The New Republic* of New York, which contains an article dealing with the condition of farmers in the United States to-day. It reads as follows:

With the failure of farm income, deflation occurred, followed by a land crisis. Bankruptcies and foreclosures were widespread and inevitable, and the tragic procession of defeated farm families began to move citywards, seeking livelihood in other occupations than those to which they had been trained. By 1924 it was a migration; then a rout. To-day we know that we suffered a net loss in farm population of four millions, and still land panic is with us. Farms are still being foreclosed in numbers by mortgagors, and land prices are strikingly subnormal.

The *Ottawa Journal*, an independent paper published in this city—

An hon. MEMBER: An independent paper?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I am just taking it at its own valuation. The *Ottawa Journal* of May, 1928, speaking of farm conditions in the United States, has the following to say:

Agriculture has not shared in United States prosperity. Of 6,371,640 farms between Maine and the Golden Gate one in five is mortgaged for 40 per cent; two in five are on unimproved roads; only one in twelve has improved machinery. So says the United States Census Bureau.

The result is that to-day the farmers of the United States are demanding such fantastic schemes of relief as the McNary-Haugen relief

[Mr. E. J. Young.]

bill, and you cannot blame them because they have been promised better prices if they would vote for protection. They voted for protection but the better prices never came, and now they are asking congress to guarantee those better prices.

The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) made a reference to a particular case in his speech which I cannot allow to pass unnoticed. He referred to a shipper, I think it was in Toronto, who sent a consignment of dress goods to Detroit, only to find that the United States tariff had been raised overnight and the shipment could not enter. In the United States tariff there is a provision which is called the flexible provision, and which permits the president to increase the duty by 50 per cent under certain conditions. The inference was that this flexible provision had been used and the duty raised so that this shipment could not enter the country. That story has been going around in different forms for the last two or three years; sometimes it is ladies' dresses sometimes it is sweaters, and sometimes it is iron and steel goods. I have tried repeatedly to trace these stories down but have been unable as yet to find that there was one authentic case.

Mr. MANION: I will give you one.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Give me the particulars of the case, the name of the shipper, the name of the consignee, the date of the shipment and the description of the goods. I will undertake to investigate any cases and for every one which proves to be authentic I will produce five cases where our own Customs department has done the same thing, or even worse.

Mr. MANION: That has nothing to do with the question I asked a minute ago.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): It has a whole lot to do with the question of retaliation. If we are going to resent that sort of thing on the part of the United States government, they have much more cause to resent it on our part.

The member for Last Mountain (Mr. Fansher) referred in his speech to a matter on which I would like to comment, the classification of the new combined harvester-thresher. When the customs tariff was drawn up there was no such machine coming into the country. Harvesting machines were put in the 6 per cent class, but this machine has been put in the 10 per cent class. I consider the request of the hon. member that it be put in the 6 per cent class to be a very reasonable one, and I urge the minister to do this. I