

here, are struggling between success and failure every hour. It will accord some relief to them and I believe it is the bounden duty of the government to so afford it.

If ever there was a time in the history of this country when the farming population both east and west needed relief, now is the time.

Mr. Meighen continued:

From 10 to 20 per cent is about the addition which these manufacturers are able to obtain from our farmers, by reason of the increased protection afforded them by this government.

But it has remained for this government to push the line far beyond that, and they have not only given the manufacturers a grip on the whole home market, but practically given them a monopoly of it and they have taxed the consumer in order to push the manufacturers and their industries successfully into the markets of the world.

He was speaking of a time prior to 1911 and it seems to me that that paragraph is eloquently descriptive of conditions which have existed during the last five years. He concludes with this statement:

But before I go into that, let me give a few figures to show that the conditions of manufacture at the present time do not warrant a very material duty of any kind... and I think I will convince the house that there is very little, if any difference in the cost of production of these machines on this side of the border and in the United States.... They (the manufacturers) are able under this tariff to exact a higher price than they could exact if the tariff were lower. It (the reduction of the tariff) will accord some relief to consumers and I believe it is the bounden duty of government to so afford it.

For a generation or more the farmers of Canada have been definitely of the opinion that the tariff did increase the price of agricultural implements, and they were confirmed in that opinion by the statements of such leading men as the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen. In 1914 the duty on agricultural implements was reduced to 12½ per cent under the general tariff. In 1920, speaking on this subject, the president of the Massey-Harris Company said:

Speaking on behalf of the company which I represent, I emphatically state that the privileges which are conferred on us by the protective duties have not been of very great advantage to us....

So far as the Massey-Harris Company is concerned, even to-day, examining it from the only standpoint of money making the company would perfectly be willing to face the withdrawal of the protective duty on farm implements, "if at the same time the tax was lifted upon all material which enters into their manufacture."

In 1922 when the Liberal government came into power there was a slight reduction in the duty and in 1924 that duty was reduced to six per cent. Reading the debates of that time I am amazed that our Conservative friends of that day should have regarded that tariff rate as free trade. They painted a

gloomy picture of a destitute industrial life, migration to the United States and the devastation of industry generally. It is all very difficult to follow. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Spence), speaking on May 1, 1924, used this language:

For free trade would drive away our population. Free trade would shut up our industries and the population would leave the urban centres.

He was concerned for the future of the city of Hamilton, for he went on to say:

As a result the population of Hamilton would soon be reduced from 110,000 to 50,000. This may actually occur, because a free trade policy is bound to bring about such a result if it does nothing else. My hon. friend here (Mr. Senn) is a truck farmer and lives within twenty miles of Hamilton. He does not do any growling. On the contrary, he is bringing in his produce and finding a ready market for it in Hamilton, for the city has a population sufficient to consume all the fruit and garden truck grown within forty miles of its boundaries. But what is going to happen when we depopulate this urban centre? What are we going to do? Land will drop in value fifty per cent because the price of land fluctuates with the price of farm products.

Addressing the treasury benches he said:

You gentlemen need a little more experience. Your mind is too narrow; you are continually thinking of yourselves to the exclusion of everybody else.

Is that not a gloomy picture? Well, we are happy to say that that picture was not realized. The city of Hamilton, then with a population of 110,000, by 1931 gloried in a population of 155,000, and we have the hon. gentleman to whom he referred in such lugubrious terms, the member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn), sitting in this house looking hale, hearty and prosperous.

Then too at this time Mr. Thomas Bradshaw, who was then general manager of the Massey-Harris Company, gave evidence. I will not refer in detail to that evidence except to read this:

I will not say all our machines, because that is not the case, but some machines are manufactured more cheaply in the States than they are in Toronto, and vice versa.

I cite that just as an illustration of the fact that the question was gone into with great thoroughness and in great detail. I was also interested in reading the speech delivered by the present hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), who at that time declaimed against the reduction in the duty on agricultural implements, because he said it would foment and augment the migration of workers to the United States. He pictured the disappearance of the Massey-Harris Company; he seemed afraid that they would take Massey