

just \$15,000, besides a duty of ten to thirty per cent on the products of this metal, which duty the consumers must pay. The salaries of the minister, deputy and staff at Ottawa alone of the Customs department last year amounted to over \$534,000. Drawbacks paid in 1925 on material for use of manufacturers on exported goods amounted to \$10,420,019, and drawbacks on goods consumed at home amounted to \$1,533,175, or a total of \$11,953,294 in drawbacks alone. There was a total expenditure in that department of \$22,018,007. But this is only a small part of what it has cost this country to give manufacturers a price-fixing power on their products, which price the consumer must pay. I find that General Motors of Canada, at Oshawa, Ontario, one company alone, received a drawback of \$2,165,107, while we have to pay over thirty per cent too much for our motor cars because of import penalties. But that is only one company out of 132 that benefits under this drawback, and yet the hon. member quibbles about the name that should be given to such a nefarious system. Yes, I say robbery, robbery as true to-day as it was in the days of Sir Richard Cartwright.

But let us go back and take a glance again at these drawbacks. Not only did we spend nearly \$12,000,000 of public funds to enable the manufacturers to scour the world for raw materials, but we have maintained on the free list practically everything they need to use in their factories. I say public funds, because since the policy of this country is one of protection that money is taken out of current revenue without a doubt. They tell us that free trade is a myth; but when it comes to the point where they themselves are obliged to purchase supplies the manufacturers are all free traders. The tariff schedule is perhaps the most one-sided piece of legislation extant to-day. I question if there is in the whole world a piece of legislation that so completely delivers one class of the people over to another to be exploited, a class whose interests have become by legislation of privilege entirely out of line with the interests of the rest of the people. On pages 66 and 67 of the Customs Tariff we find a whole list of articles on the free list. I would invite hon. gentlemen to peruse this book and see the one-sidedness of the whole thing, the discrimination against the agriculturist and the consumers of the country in general. Take pages 93 and 97 again, dealing with manufacturers' supplies, or pages 98 to 100 inclusive with reference to drawbacks, and you will realize how utterly unfair and one-sided the tariff system is. We tax ourselves to give

[Mr. Evans.]

the manufacturers an advantage; surely then it is not too much to expect that their raw material shall be purchased at home so as to give employment to our working men. But such is not the case. This Customs Tariff provides that our manufacturers shall enjoy all the advantages possible to enable them to scour the world for the cheapest raw material while our own raw material and our natural resources go undeveloped, although we tax ourselves for the sake of the manufacturers. We maintain on the free list even importations of iron and steel, the product of foreign mines, while the suppliants of privilege in this House prate about a home market for the farmer. What with bonuses, bounties, tariffs and other things, we have given millions for the production of steel in our own country, and yet in the very place in this Dominion to-day where working men are starving there is a company who have benefited by the system of protection and bonuses and bounties and free raw material, importing these things to work in their own smelting furnaces. We have scoured the whole world for scrap iron, old steel, old rails, and so on, importing them free under item 775 of the tariff, while the people have to pay from 20 to 35 per cent for the products made from these metals. I would advise hon. gentlemen to consult items 414 and 417 which I will not detain the House to read just now.

Our manufacturers do not believe in their own policy. By protection they have driven the cost of doing anything in this country out of line with world prices, and to-day they find it cheaper to import their own raw material than to secure it in this country. Then they come here and claim protection under the tariff to look after the working man. What a fallacy. In this parliament we have suddenly become aware somehow of the fact that the farmer is not sufficiently protected, but I say that the farmer needs to be delivered from those who would protect him. The truth is that the price-fixing power hitherto enjoyed has become useless in defence of the labour organization, and that is the cause of the feverish anxiety for immigration to-day. It is argued that if the farmer would only demand protection it could be used as a fulcrum for the political lever to pry a little more privilege out of the people. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) yesterday deplored the sending of natural products from Canada to other countries, but I would point out that this goes on only in proportion to the extent of the want of enterprise and patriotism on the part of our industrialists and capitalists. For instance, the