annual statement from their offices in Montreal, from which it appears that notwithstanding the fact that they have been able to operate only at half their capacity they earned 13½ per cent on their capital. Before the tariff board it was shown that the salt manufacturers combined made 25 per cent on their capital. It was not a little drawback that they wanted. Like the good, honest, solid Canadians that I have always found in our industrial captains, they took far more pride in the development of their business and in the employment of fellow-Canadians than in securing the few paltry dollars offered them in drawbacks.

Then there is another matter that requires a little investigation in connection with this drawback game. Let me give the house this statement:

Statement showing the total amount paid for customs drawbacks, annually, back to March 31st 1921, and in five year periods preceding

Fiscal year 1927-28 (11 months to Feb. 29/28)......\$11,338,738 14 Fiscal year 1926-27...... 14,639,450 94 Fiscal year 1925-26..... 14,706,419 28 10,610,742 77 Fiscal year 1924-25..... Fiscal year 1923-24..... 11,719,152 44 13,400,508 25

Fiscal year 1922-23. . . . . . Fiscal year 1921-22. . . . . . 10,741,682 04 Fiscal year 1920-21.. .. .. 12,839,914 41

ive year p	eriods.			
Fiscal year	r 1915-16	 	 3,599,844	77
Fiscal year	r 1910-11	 	 789,395	27
Fiscal year	r 1905-06	 	 242,853	77
Fiscal year	r 1900-01	 	 138,947	80
Fiscal year	r 1895-96	 	 149,218	27
Fiscal year	r 1890-91	 	 134,388	86

Previous to 1890-91 no separate record of paid Drawbacks appears to have been kept.

I can quite appreciate the fact that a drawback is justifiable and perfectly sound from a national point of view. If a man brings in his raw material from a foreign country and manufactures it in Canada and then exports the finished product he is entitled to drawback. And the law permits it. But when it comes to giving drawbacks to some people in lieu of some other things they would like to have, it seems to me that this is absolutely wrong. What should this country do? Only one thing: the people should get rid of a government which fails to take advantage of the opportunities that offer; they want to do away with a job-killing government and replace it with a job-making administration. Read the remarks of the president of the Bank of Montreal a few days ago and you will get an idea of what should be the immigration policy of this country. From time immemorial people have moved from one country to another for one of two reasons;

either to improve their position or to find employment. If this government only had sufficient faith in the country and could be induced to change its course and adopt a policy of protection, and provide that protection openly and honestly at the front door instead of at the back door, endeavouring thereby to provide employment for those people who are already in Canada as well as for others who might wish to come-if this were done we could dispense with a minister of immigration altogether.

The chief business before the country today is to undertake by every means possible to provide work for the people. Someone will ask, what about the automobile business in Oshawa? The government amended the tariff in this industry and I do not propose to say much on that score. The change was intended to effect great results. But what has happened? People generally do not realise it, but there has been an increase of 28 per cent in importations of automobiles into Canada, every one of which could have been manufactured in this country by Canadian workmen. This would have provided employment for 2,000 men. Reckoning fivemembers to a family, this would mean 10,000 of a population who might have been retained in the country. But by one stroke of the pen the government drives from our shores all these people and then calls upon the Minister of Immigration to tour the world in search of 10,000 others to come in and take their place. The government, so to speak, are pouring material in at the top of the sack while it is running out at the bottom. If they only had sufficient common sense to sew up the hole at the bottom of the sack they would save all the loss that is now going on. The most pathetic thing I have ever witnessed was a village which was destroyed by tariff changes. Would any other country be guilty of such a thing? I venture to say you would not find the United States government following any course which would result in the shutting down of a single industry or the closing-up of a single home resulting in the exodus of its population. This sort of thing must come to an end in Canada. The government must have a change of heart or it will be the business of the people of this Dominion to put in a government who will see to it that sufficient work is provided for all.

On motion of Mr. Bennett the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing