

wages, and they have refused to let go of that increase. I merely state a fact. They claim their right to retain what they have, because the cost of living has not decreased; but they have failed to realize that it is mainly because of the high wage they receive that the cost of living remains high. Why should I reproach them with their desire to maintain their present wage? Do we not see throughout the world evidences that one thinks first of himself? The wage-earner who has been able to double his pay thinks he should look after himself first and retain that high wage. The real trouble has been that farm labour is given very meagre recompense as compared with the wages of labour in towns and cities. Hence the complaint from the farmer particularly against the high cost of manufactured goods. The farmers have been complaining that while their own products were being sold at a reduced figure, manufactured goods which they had to buy were at a high level. Strange to say, we now hear some of our manufacturers also complaining. But, happily, both on the farm and in the towns and cities, all have been at work, and, as I have said, there is less unemployment than heretofore in Canada, and our country is in better condition, I would say, than any other country in the world.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: What about the conditions in the West?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Conditions in the West have been improving, and, except in a certain part of Manitoba, they have had a splendid crop. It is true, they have not sold that crop at a very high figure and we hear them still complaining of their lot; and I sympathize with them. They are passing resolutions and asking for remedies. In their demands they also want reduced expenditure, but at the same time they ask for the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway. It is evident that they want a reduced tariff.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: You are going to give it to them too, are you not?

Hon. Mr. WATSON: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: They believe that the tariff as it stands, in regard to most things, tends to keep prices too high. They find that the selling price of their own products is governed by world conditions, and they clamour for a reduction in the cost of living. At the same time I recognize that, while they are asking for a reduced tariff, the manufacturers' association is clamouring for an increase. It is in the Parliament of Canada that those conflicting interests meet. It is for the

Government and Parliament to try to hold the scales evenly between those two big contributors to our wealth, the agricultural interest and the industrial.

I have said that the manufacturers were clamouring for a higher tariff. Those who have been either in public life or in business know of the difficulties of tariff adjustment. It is no easy matter to make a tariff that will suit everyone. It is difficult even to get the beneficiaries of a tariff to agree among themselves as to what is equitable. I remember that in 1903, 1904 or 1905 the Manufacturers' Association tried their hand at the preparation of a scientific tariff. They set their various sections to work—the iron, steel and textile industries and all the various other branches—in order to try to reconcile the interests in those different sections. They found the work so difficult that they abandoned it. They never concluded their labours, because the difficulty of harmonizing different interests was insuperable. The raw material of one industry was the finished product, or part of the finished product, of the other. There was such pyramiding in preparing a tariff that would satisfy the raw-material man and the subsequent users that the work had to be abandoned. I recognize that the revision of a tariff, or even the mention of a tariff, in the Parliament of Canada, frightens the manufacturer. When the right honourable the junior member for Ottawa (Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster) tried his hand at readjusting the tariff, I remember what alarm he created among the manufacturers of Canada, and the recriminations which resulted from the slight alterations that he made. Again in 1897 the manufacturers were—I will not say scandalized, but they were frightened at the first preference which was given to Great Britain. They gradually perceived that, although they had been fearful, no harm was done, as they prospered under that tariff. In 1911 they went into a frenzy when Mr. Fielding, after his negotiations, brought back the proposed treaty for reciprocity in natural products. They were not affected, yet it seemed as if the temple had been shaken down upon their heads. They cruelly, selfishly, banded together to close the door of the United States to the Canadian farmer.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: The United States farmers did that.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: No, no. Congress passed the law and it remained on the Statute Book at Washington up to last year. Perhaps it is still there. But it was the vested interests in the East who succeeded in raising