

I ask the Prime Minister and the hon. leader of the opposition to remember and again to take to heart the plight of the Saskatchewan farm loan board. The same system has reduced our maritime provinces to a state of dependence on this parliament, and their only hopeful outlook at the present time seems to be a more and more liberal fulfilment of the Duncan recommendations.

Let me ask the leader of the opposition, if after the next election he is the prime minister of this country, what will he do to meet a situation such as we are facing at the present time with unemployment so acute as it is, with the best part of last year's crop of wheat on our hands; will he and his government take the wheat of the farmers at a price that will leave some profit for the raising of it?

Mr. BROWN: Is the hon. gentleman advocating that?

Mr. EVANS: No, I am not advocating it. But what will the leader of the opposition do, seeing that this parliament has guaranteed to him and his clients a complete profit over the whole of their output whether sold for domestic use or in the foreign market? What is he going to do for agriculture when facing a situation such as this? Retaliation? What is retaliation? Retaliation, according to the idea of the protectionists, is to raise the tariff in this country so high that no goods can come in, but still allow our manufacturers to export goods over the top of any tariff wall that any other country may erect. There is no other meaning to retaliation. There cannot be such a thing as retaliation against anyone in a foreign country by erecting a higher tariff wall around Canada.

To meet a supposed situation in the United States our manufacturers are calling for a higher tariff. Who will be the sufferers? The consumers of Canada alone. If France puts a duty of 73 cents a bushel on our wheat, who suffers? The French consumers. We are guaranteeing a profit to our manufacturers, who call for more and more protection to the extent that they may charge the home consumer a price that will give them a profit over the whole of their output, whether sold at home or abroad. There is no other reason in asking for higher protection to-day. Our present tariff has reduced the western farmer to a state where he can hardly make ends meet. To-day in Canada a man cannot on his own ability and industry establish himself in any small enterprise, chicken-raising, if you like, or a small farm, the cost of everything having gone up too much to allow this; and

prices are going higher and still higher. To-day the cost of living in Canada is as high or higher than in any other country in the world to which we are shipping our goods. I had the pleasure of laying a set of figures before the immigration inquiry commission of the Saskatchewan government, at present sitting in Saskatchewan. Taking the prices of staple foods from the Labour Gazette published under the authority of the Minister of Labour here, I find that in Saskatoon the price of bread for the month of December averaged 8.8 cents a pound, while in the British Isles where we ship our flour and our wheat it was 4.8 cents. But that is not the only evil of protection. Protection unites everyone who has a privilege and a benefit under it. Our millers to-day are controlling our bakeries, and it is only where there is plenty of competition from private parties that the price of bread is even somewhere near where it ought to be. While bread was 8.8 cents a pound in Saskatoon, it was 6.7 cents a pound in Fort William. These are things which I want the government to know. Prices for necessaries are now such that no working man can afford even to establish a home.

As I say, I listened to the speeches of the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition in Saskatoon, and I was much amused at an exhibition which the leader of the opposition made before his audience by producing a five dollar bill. It seems that some shippers of certain goods in British Columbia had been importing their packing cases from the United States, and the hon. leader of the opposition produced a five dollar bill and said: If this money had only been spent in Canada it would have gone around to the lumber-workers and to those who feed them and so on. Well, I expect he impressed the natives of British Columbia with the same exhibition; evidently he got away with his joke and the five dollar bill in that province. But in Saskatoon he never said where he got all that money; and what impressed me more than anything was that he never said where the five dollar bill went. He said: Now, we will take this five dollar bill. "Take" was the word, and that is the method of the protectionist, I believe. Then he told the audience that some of the requirements of certain primary producers were being imported from the United States, that if these things had been manufactured in Canada this five dollar bill would have circulated among the lumber-workers and all those who produced to feed the men who made these articles. But never mind where it came from, let us follow this five dollar bill and see