

What single product has brought more ready cash than anything else into this country to be spent on the products of industrial Quebec and Ontario?

The grain crops of the western provinces.

Italy would love to include the western provinces in the Roman empire.

The western provinces will come back—make no mistake about that.

It goes further along the same lines. We are glad to have this support from an eastern newspaper. It has an understanding and appreciation of the fundamentals underlying the Canadian background; but not so with some others. In the same editorial I find this:

Yet here in eastern Canada are some who are talking as though the western provinces were a liability instead of an asset—some who would grudge generous help to these provinces to tide them over the troubles caused by a depression that hit these provinces harder than any other part of the dominion.

There are some, a few, who speak and write about all agriculture as if it should not be assisted.

Referring to the minister's measures for agricultural relief the Windsor *Daily Star* of April 7 in an editorial entitled, "Bonused Agriculture," omits even a passing word about bonused industry, but as it is the most intelligent criticism I have seen and sums up generally the objections, I shall deal with it briefly.

It states that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) desires to establish the principle of minimum price applicable to dairying, the fruit industry and all other branches of agriculture across Canada. This is true. Also it is, in the circumstances, logical and sound. Agriculture did not ask for this until it was compelled to do so. It has been forced upon agriculture and newspapers which speak as this editorial does, must accept the principle and support it, or else watch the destruction of agriculture under our existing system.

I live in the west. Suppose I wish to buy an automobile at Windsor; the price of the wheat the farmer sells in western Canada is determined by the price in the Liverpool market, less transportation charges in getting it there. The price of the automobile I buy in Windsor is determined by the United States market, plus the tariff imposed by the government, plus, up until a short time ago, excise taxes, and any other costs of bringing the automobile across the border.

The situation, therefore, as defined by the editorial is this: With 60-cent wheat and a car costing, for example, \$1,000, I must pay 1,666 bushels of wheat for the car. But the

[Mr. F. D. MacKenzie.]

price of the car is raised to \$1,200—really an understatement of facts—by tariff enactments, and therefore I am compelled to pay 2,000 bushels of wheat for my Windsor car. Does it not seem fair to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government, which by legal enactment has given a United States firm manufacturing automobiles in Canada the right to charge me 20 per cent more for my car, should also provide me with a price for my wheat which will permit me to meet on terms of perfect equality my United States friends now manufacturing automobiles in the Dominion of Canada?

The answer to these questions is given in this editorial. I quote in part:

Any such principle would be a sharp departure from the system upon which agriculture has made its contribution to Canada up to the present time.

The wreck of agriculture under the very system they support is the perfect answer to that question. We have watched during the last few years the price of manufactured goods established at a level which makes it impossible for the farmers to buy. We have watched, too, the men on relief in the city of Windsor. They are on relief because you will not permit the farmers and other basic producers of Canada to purchase the goods produced in the city of Windsor. We cannot exchange products, the price of which is determined by the world level, for products the price of which is determined by the management of the company which produces them, aided by legislation passed by the dominion government. The editorial goes on:

In effect, of course, such a principle would be a step towards state socialism, which would mean that the government would fix the price paid by the farmer rather than the market doing so.

May I ask at this point: Is the price of an automobile determined by the market? Is the price of our textile products determined by the market? Or is not the tariff, which in some instances runs from sixty to eighty per cent on the conversion costs of changing raw materials into finished products, a factor in determining the price?

Do you want socialism for manufacturers, and capitalism for farmers and basic producers? And do you then expect to found a unified and prosperous nation upon what would be defined as directly opposite systems existing together in a democratic country?

The editorial also advances this contention, that the farmers will be dependent upon the government for their price. Some time ago it was proposed to remove the excise tax