

ing for at prices which are equitable. We are aiding the export to the orient of automobiles, things which cannot be made and sold in Canada unless the government gives the manufacturers the legal right to rob the home consumer of about one-third of the price. Is this reasonable? It seems that all industry depends upon agriculture in this country. I have heard from beginning to end of this session and every session I have been in the house until now, a wail from the protectionists. They cannot stand on their own feet. They have to charge the home consumer a price that gives them a profit over the whole of their output whether it is sold at home or abroad. This cannot continue any longer. I wonder how long the farmers of Canada will allow the government to provide our competitors with agricultural implements at prices cheaper than we can buy them for at home? Canadian-made implements are sold in foreign countries to our own competitors cheaper than the Canadian farmer can buy them.

Even some members of parliament are willing to laugh at the farmers and say that they are becoming protectionists. I should like to know whether the skyscrapers of Toronto and the tariff-built cities of eastern Canada are of more importance to this country than the whole agricultural industry of the Dominion. Why do we maintain on our statute books to-day an act that makes it possible to plunder the only industry that is worth while, the only one that can stand on its own feet, while our manufacturers fail to learn the simple lesson of economy and morality? I want for the Australian treaty some reason based on equity and justice for all classes. Is it for the good of Canada or not? Is it to be based on mere silly sentimental loyalty of trading within the empire? If I want to judge the love of the government for other members of the empire, I can point to the restrictions which they have placed upon the British preference.

The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) said the other day that we import 50,000,000 pounds of butter per annum. Why do we do that? It is strange, is it not? The reason is simply this: our farmers find it more profitable to do other work than to make butter or perhaps I should put it in another way and say: There is less loss in other things than in making butter. Let me ask the government to-day: if they want us to make butter, why penalize us by an import duty as high as nearly one-third of the value of everything we have to use? I repeat: We are the class that do not ask favours. If my Conservative friends want an explanation as

to why we should have free trade, let them ask their former leader, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), when as leader of their party he insisted on free trade in hatbands and hat-sweats.

Mr. BENNETT: That was because the heads of the government were growing so fast.

Mr. EVANS: Why did the hon. member for South Wellington insist on this? Perhaps the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) will answer the question. Why all this concern about butter when, if a duty were placed on hatbands, we might have a flourishing industry in that line? There is only one answer: it is not profitable for our hatmakers to make their own hatbands and hat-sweats. If our farmers choose to do something other than to make butter, who should care? But the two-facedness of the whole matter is seen in that our protectionist friends on both sides maintain a duty on all our needs. If you want to help the farmer, give him his necessities of life free; keep down his cost of production; let him have a chance to do his dairying without being penalized on everything he needs to buy. On churns he is penalized 30 per cent; on cans, moulds, rollers, butter workers, besides all the necessities of life he is penalized around one-third of the value. Even the salt is charged at a high duty except for those few, such as packers and so on, with whom the politicians can make a bargain. Then, as if it were not enough to charge a duty on salt, the old bags and barrels in which it may be imported pay a duty of 25 per cent as well, although they are things which cannot enter into competition with any Canadian industry.

Two splendid speeches came from the other side of the house when this matter was under discussion on a previous occasion. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) and the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Hepburn) were both carried away by their eloquence in making excuses for the Australian and New Zealand treaties, but not one reason was given by either of them to show why an added load should be placed on agriculture and labour for the sake of those who already have a licence to plunder these classes. If the country takes note of this whole discussion, it is bound to come to the conclusion that the Liberal and Conservative parties in the house are giving a wonderful exhibition of Canadian politics, the one side condemning the other and both of them fighting from behind their party stockades, afraid to come out into the open. Where is the Consumer's League? Where is the hon. member for South Huron?