

increased cost of living—no increase in wages paid to industrial workers—the farmers in sharp distress. I may be permitted, sir, to read the last paragraph of the editorial:

In short, the big manufacturers have benefited a great deal, the wage earners are about where they were before the law was passed, the general public are finding it harder to make ends meet and a large percentage of the farming population are in sharp distress. The high duties on agricultural products have proved a delusion and a snare. Since the passage of the emergency tariff bill in May, 1921, placing a duty of thirty-five cents a bushel on wheat (reduced to thirty cents in the Fordney-McCumber Act and raised to 42 cents in 1923) four hundred thousand farmers in the fifteen wheat-growing states have gone into bankruptcy.

Some might say that 1924 was too soon after the adoption of protection for the farmer for its benefits to be reflected on the farmers condition. During the congressional session of 1926, Senator Arthur Capper of Indiana, speaking before the United States senate on the plight of the American farmer, said that:—

—the first five years of protection for farmers saw more farm foreclosures than the preceding twenty years.

Further evidence of the failure of this policy can be seen in the attempt, during the last three sessions of congress, to pass the McNary-Haugen bill—a bill which attempts to bonus the American farmer by artificial means.

Perhaps the worst condemnation of the policy outlined in the Conservative amendment is found in the fact that this very month, April, 1929, eight years after the United States Emergency Tariff Act and seven years after the passage of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, a special session of congress is being called to consider the plight of the American farmer. The policy adopted in the United States in 1921 and 1922 has practically ruined the agricultural industry in that country.

The amendment is held out as a bait to the Canadian farmer. In the same speech the hon. member for South Wellington advocates an increase in the tariff on agricultural implements and woollen goods, and asks for an element of protection which the Canadian tariff does not now afford. Other prominent members of his party followed, asking for increased tariffs on coal and steel. Since the Winnipeg convention they have advocated increased duties on farm implements, binder twine, automobiles, clothing, boots and shoes, and practically everything that enters into the cost of agricultural production. Then to cap it all the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) in his

speech tells the people of Canada that increased tariffs do not mean increased prices.

The Canadian farmer is neither blind nor stupid. He will be able to see through this amendment and the speeches that accompanied it. He will recognize in this policy the same gallows on which the American farmer was hanged. The hon. member for South Wellington used the term "gold brick" several times during his address. Well, the proverbial gold brick was at least attractive on the outside, while his policy has nothing about it to attract anyone. No one can blame the Conservative party for going to the United States for a policy. That is their right. But we can attach a great deal of blame to them for bringing forward a policy that has proven a dismal failure in the country from which they imported it.

Political parties may well turn their attention to agriculture. Agriculture is Canada's basic industry. The estimated agricultural wealth of Canada for 1928 is over eight billions of dollars and the estimated value of agricultural production for the same year is \$1,731,805,000. We hear a lot of idle talk about worn out soils, wheat mining, and suggestions that the supremacy of agriculture is just a passing phase in our history. But, sir, soil does not deteriorate if properly farmed; it becomes more productive under scientific tillage. The wheat yields of Canada are increasing. There has been a decided increase in the yield per acre during the past fifteen years. Agriculture is, and will continue to be, the greatest source of wealth production that we have. But, while agriculture is in a much better condition today than 1921, it is well known that the farmers generally are not enjoying the measure of prosperity that is found in other industries. It is because of this fact that I suggest that all political parties should turn their attention to this great industry.

What is wrong with agriculture? In our endeavours to build up industries in Canada, we have ignored our greatest industry. We have pampered and bonused our secondary industries at the expense of our agricultural industry. Agriculture must be considered with all our other industries if we are to have a properly balanced nation. The farmers are justified in demanding that their industry be placed on an equality with other industries.

What is the foundation on which our manufacturing industries have been built up? The right to buy their raw materials in the best markets. No government would interfere with that right. No government would dare to tax the raw materials of the textile in-