

1360. This list, which covers 19 pages of Hansard, shows the reductions made between 1922 and 1928. This is the greatest list of reductions that can be shown for any similar period since confederation. He could have told them that this government inaugurated old age pensions, which have been of immeasurable benefit to many of his people. He could have told them that because some of his people had been placed on poor land when arriving here as immigrants this government amended the Homestead Act so as to allow them to take up a second homestead. He could have told them that this government brought down an amendment to the Naturalization Act, which would have removed much of the difficulty and expense which his people now encounter when seeking naturalization. He could have given many enlightening facts to his people in that portion of his speech which he devoted to nursery rhymes and bedtime stories.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to deal for a few minutes with the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) which lays down the Conservative policy on the tariff. This amendment appears on page 758 of Hansard of March 7, 1929, as follows:

This house regrets that the financial proposals of the government make no provision for reasonably safeguarding and protecting the interests of those "engaged in agricultural pursuits or in industrial" employment in Canada.

In the course of his speech the hon. gentleman said—and I am quoting from page 757 of Hansard:

...We must introduce into the tariff of this country, to protect our own people, that element of protection which the Canadian tariff does not now afford.

It looks as though we were going to have a repetition in this country of the United States tariff campaigns of 1920 and 1921 in which the cry was "protect the farmer." Hon. members will recall that deflation in prices during 1920 left the farmers in a serious condition. In the United States this condition was to be remedied by protection on farm products. A great protectionist campaign was waged, and the farmers swallowed it hook, line and sinker. The sinker turned out to be the most effective part of the equipment.

This campaign was followed by the passing of the Emergency Tariff Act, May 1921, and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922. The latter was supposed to be the last word in protection for the farmer. But Mr. Speaker, the condition of the United States farmer grew worse after the passing of the

[Mr. Bancroft.]

Fordney-McCumber tariff bill. Why? When the Fordney-McCumber bill was before the United States senate, Senator Underwood of Alabama said—I quote from page 27 of "Farmers Tariff Studies"—

Where the fallacy of this argument comes is that under the guise of doing something to help the farmers in some particular item, their support is asked for a bill of which, as a whole, it seems that for every dollar the farmers may derive from the bill, they will pay \$100 in taxes for the benefit of somebody else.

What did he refer to in that statement? I have under my hand the following items from the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922:

	%	%
Pig iron..	2.2	raised to 41
Bar steel..	13	raised to 27
Structural steel.. . . .	10	raised to 25
Cast iron pipe.. . . .	10	raised to 20
Wrought pipe..	20	raised to 27
Builders hardware & locks	20	raised to 40
Wire..	26	raised to 41
Stamped ware..	20	raised to 40
Sanitary ware—bath, sinks & lavatories..	20	raised to 40
Nails..	free	raised to 16
Sewing machines.. . . .	free	raised to 15 & 30 if over \$75 valuation
Gas engines..	15	raised to 30
Pumps..	15	raised to 30
Windmills..	15	raised to 30
Hosiery & knit goods..	36.9	raised to 66.6
Cotton thread..	15	raised to 35
Aluminum..	21	raised to 45
Salt..	free	raised to 30.3
Leather gloves..	13.7	raised to 50
Window glass..	9.6	raised to 28

These are just a few items selected from the bill. It can readily be seen that the campaign of protection for the farmers was just a scheme to get the farmers' support for an increased tariff on manufactured goods. The increased tariff on manufactured goods affected the farmers' cost of production and left him worse off than he was before the passage of the Emergency and Fordney bills. The United States farmer got 42 cents a bushel protection on wheat, 12 cents a pound on butter and so on all along the line. These duties were put on to make the farmers feel that the tariff was framed in their interests. But the farmers of the United States have learned that these high duties on agricultural products were just fakes put there to keep them quiet while the tariff on manufactured goods was being boosted to the limit.

Senator David R. Walsh of Massachusetts reviewed the first year's operation of the Fordney Act, and I have here an editorial from the Manitoba Free Press of February 4th, 1924, which condenses the facts brought out in his speech: increased profits to manufacturers accounted for by higher prices—