

much needed lesson, I am hoping that the stagnation in employment to-day and in the wheat market will be a lesson which the government will take to heart. Never before I think has Canada seen such a situation. Our elevators are filled with wheat, the warehouses of our manufacturers are filled with manufactured goods, and yet bread lines are to be seen in our cities. In fact, the first bread line in my own city was seen this winter. We are hoping now for better times. When the leader of the opposition asked yesterday, what has this government done for agriculture, the Prime Minister answered him: See, we have taken two leaders of the Progressive party into the cabinet. What have we in this corner of the house to say about that? All we can say is this, that the tariff kills agriculture, and I want to state that protection is a little more complete to-day than it has ever been before in the history of agriculture in western Canada. Speculation is but the natural outcome of this country's policy of protection. The tariff system is a means of getting something for nothing. Besides, it ties up the working population to capitalistic concerns in industrial centres, in order to seek for a living. Protection forbids individual enterprise and industry, and naturally the people look for some outlet, some form of adventure, and there is nothing open to them but speculation. Speculation and protection—the one is as immoral in its consequences as the other. I admit that perhaps the tariff schedules are not any higher to-day, but just the same, protection is more complete. The British preference was inaugurated to offset the price-fixing power of our distributing combines which Sir Wilfrid Laurier saw would know no bounds, and while to-day the whole Liberal party revere the name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, it does not seem that there is anyone who has the courage to come out on the principles of the Liberal platform.

To show that protection is more complete to-day, I want to quote a series of prices from the monthly bulletin of agricultural statistics for December. It shows that, in November, flour in Winnipeg was selling at \$4.26 per one hundred pounds, and in Minneapolis at \$3.76½ per one hundred pounds. So that in the United States, which is the paradise of protection, according to those who desire the protectionist privilege to be maintained, the people are not bled of their earnings to anything like the same extent as the people north of the boundary line. But I will not take simply one month, because there may be variations in the prices of wheat and flour in different countries in certain months. I will take a series of six months, to show that flour

[Mr. Evans.]

was selling cheaper in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg. In May per barrel it was selling in Minneapolis 62 cents cheaper than in Winnipeg; in June, 36 cents cheaper; July, 71 cents cheaper; August, \$1.57 cheaper; September, \$1.30 cheaper; October, \$1.17 cheaper; November, \$1.07 cheaper.

Again, I find that the average Winnipeg price for "Manitoba top patent" flour for the month was \$3.41½ per cwt. in Liverpool as compared with \$4.26 in Winnipeg; in other words, it was selling 84½ cents cheaper in Liverpool than in Winnipeg, and I think the flour is just the same strength and quality in both places.

As I say, I am hoping for better things, seeing that now we have some of the leading cabinet positions filled by men who have had academic training in the right school, men who helped to formulate the farmers' platform, in which direct taxation is one of the chief planks. I only hope that these gentlemen will put into practice the knowledge which they have of agriculture. Either they will do this or they will sink their individuality in a system and in a current of circumstances in which they will find themselves as helpless as a log in a stream. Which is it to be?

The Prime Minister, in answering the "retaliation" utterances of the opposition leader, said: We must treat all as one human family. Yet three years ago this government brought about the Australian treaty, which was a direct sacrifice of the interests of agriculture for the purpose of giving freer entry into the Australian market for Canadian manufacturers, particularly manufacturers of automobiles, agricultural implements and paper. Perhaps that is not the worst, but the hon. leader of the opposition has capitalized the situation created by the Australian treaty, and he has to some extent been successful in getting different branches of agriculture such as the wool growers, the egg and poultry raisers, the dairymen and others, to clamour for protection. But, as I say, the tariff system kills agriculture. Between the two parties, the Liberal party and what they have done, and the opposition party and what they propose to do, our agriculturists over this whole Dominion are being reduced to-day to a landless, dependent and confused class such as the farmers of the United States at the present time, who are looking to the government for direct aid. That is the situation in which we find ourselves to-day, and if I am not mistaken this will be the issue throughout the whole of western Canada when the next election comes round.