Does the house realize, for example, that every 100,000 people require 16 million loaves of bread yearly? By simple mathematical calculation it becomes obvious that sufficient people in Canada could turn the wheat growers' nightmare into a dream without having to depend on substantial foreign markets or on handout subsidies from the people of Canada.

The same applies to the dairy farmers in so far as their surplus butter, cheese and other products are concerned. More people in Canada supplying more domestic appetites and more domestic consumers of produce will certainly bring smiles to the faces of the dairy farmers. The advent of oil and dieselization is largely responsible for increased unemployment for coal miners, and cripples an industry that is already limping badly. Waves of new immigrants, many of whom may settle in the maritimes, will not only revive but will stimulate coal mining as an inexpensive fuel and restore employment for many of our coal miners.

The lumber industry, Mr. Speaker, is another poignant example of the urgent need for more immigrants. The president of the Canadian Lumbermen's Association called for a voluntary reduction—and I emphasize the expression—a voluntary reduction in output for 1954 because, he said, the 1953 production was not absorbed by the available market. Reduction in output means increased unemployment. The converse is equally true. Adequate markets mean increased production. More production provides increased employment.

Then the textile industry, we know, is suffering badly. Customers are its very lifeblood, and unless it receives a so-called shot in the arm large numbers of textile workers are facing unemployment. Does the house realize the extent to which technological advances have reduced employment in this industry? I am told that a factory's capacity, formerly requiring 100 employees working 40 hours per week, is now produced in half the time requiring approximately half the number of workers. To further aggravate the plight of textile manufacturers, it appears that notwithstanding all the legislation which we may enact it is impossible to stem the flow of American textiles into Canada. Consequently, without an export market and with the competition of low-priced textiles, there is little breathing space for Canadian manufactured textiles.

Most other industries in Canada are struggling with similar difficulties. Our markets are shrinking. Japan and Germany have now vigorously re-entered the export field. If a permanent peace is reached with the iron curtain countries, they too will seek additional foreign markets. With low priced labour in these countries we will find increasing difficulty in competing with them for foreign trade. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker, and almost all hon. members who have spoken in this debate have agreed upon this fact. We cannot, therefore, afford to ignore it. It is a hard and cruel fact. We may not like it, and we do not, yet it is one that we must seriously wrestle with.

What is the answer to dwindling foreign markets? To me there is but one answer. Markets we must have. If we cannot have them abroad we must have them at home, and these must be developed and maintained at the same rate and at the same pace with our production. Unless this is done our entire economy is seriously jeopardized. This largely explains our present unemployment problem causing the country much distress. It is my respectful opinion that providing spasmodic relief for unemployment by way of subsidies, unemployment insurance, increased public works or any form of social welfare relief is, as the Quebec premier quite properly termed it, only a palliative. They are definitely not cures. We must seek and find definite cures. To find them, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that we should meet the serious problem squarely head on. We should stop dodging it as we have been doing for years. We should nationally take a forthright look at ourselves in the mirror. We may be astonished at what we will see.

We will realize, Mr. Speaker, that our 15 million people are living at a national cost that could easily sustain a population of at least 30 million. For example, I am told that it costs about $60,000 to build an average mile of highway in Canada. It costs the United States, immediately across the border, the same amount to build a similar mile of highway. Yet, by ratio, a mile of highway in Canada services only 100 automobiles by comparison with 1,000 serviced in the United States.

The railroads offer a sharper illustration. It costs as much to build a mile of railway in Canada as it does in the United States. The figure, I believe, is about $100,000 per mile. Yet, the same mile of railway is put to much greater use in the United States than it is in Canada. Statements were made on the floor of the house that large numbers of railroad employees have been laid off. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who is always so genuinely and extremely concerned about these matters, asked the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marler) during one of the debates, "to allay fears of