

to provide work for the labouring man and prevent his migration to the United States as they are to retain their profits.

Mr. CALDWELL: Are the figures that my hon. friend just quoted based on the present duty?

Mr. GOULD: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it not a fact that in times past the duties were higher than they are now and consequently the total would be greater?

Mr. GOULD: I am pleased my hon. friend reminded me of the fact. If we went back to the times when the duties averaged 17½, 20 or 25 per cent the figures would reach the staggering total of billions of dollars. We have 300,000,000 acres of arable land in Canada potentially available and in view of this magnificent prospect we can well imagine how the manufacturers would like to perpetuate the system so that they could multiply the total of \$631,912,500 by five—because we have five times as much arable land to bring under cultivation yet. I ask again, is it any wonder that we raise our voices in protest, and does not our argument rest on a logical basis? I only ask permission to present these facts in a simple way so that the ordinary reader may grasp them more quickly than if they were couched in technical language.

Now, as I read it the writer went on to argue that the tariff takes the paltry amount of one cent per bushel. Very well, let us accept that estimate. We will find according to the terms that practically 994,000,000 bushels of grain were produced in Canada last year which, according to the writer's own computation, would represent \$994,000 annually. These figures, no matter how you take them, represent an unwarranted and unjustifiable fine upon agriculture. Avarice and greed stalk forth on this land under the guise of morality as represented by the beneficiaries of this vicious system of protection for a few. The system lends itself readily to incompetence and the perpetuation of an antiquated system. It fosters hatred and class domination. Wars and famine follow in its train and its sponsors laugh at the writhings of its victims.

I hold in my hand a little pamphlet which was prepared under the directions of the present government for distribution at the World's Fair in London this year. From this pamphlet I want to cite a quotation which reads as follows:

During the last twenty-five years her manufacturing industry has enjoyed a remarkable growth—

Yes it has.

—and there is good reason to believe that this will continue in the future.

So there is.

This expansion is partly attributable to Canada's natural advantages, amongst which are plentiful and diversified raw materials; an unusually extensive transportation service both by rail and by water, which facilitates the assembling of raw products at points favourably situated for their manufacture and distribution in finished form. Abundant water powers supply ample and cheap energy. The expansion of agricultural, mining and other branches of basic industry has the effect of enlarging the domestic market for manufactured products.

Every word of the statement is true and such being the case there is no reason why Canadian manufacturers should ask that a certain class of the community be penalized for their benefit. That is the attitude I take. I regard it as almost sacrilege that in a country such as we have, endowed with such wonderful natural resources men should ask to be accorded such privileges as are granted in the tariff.

Our Conservative friends have been indulging in all sorts of prophecies of impending doom. Industrial Canada, for example, is filled with accounts of meetings that have been held at which it was stated that if such and such a thing occurs some other thing will happen. These are nothing but false predictions, unjustifiable and groundless prophecy. No consideration at all is paid to the statements that were made here last year with respect to the actual condition of agriculture in Canada and the effect this was having on the general business of Canada. The thing necessary to do is to re-establish the purchasing power of the people not to perpetuate a tariff that would weaken that power still further. The manufacturers and their friends do not recognize that the purchasing power of the people of Canada is gone and even if the tariff were raised to a point high enough to satisfy the hon. member who preceded me it would have no effect because the people have not the money to purchase goods. That is the fact not only in Canada but in other countries.

In the government ranks we find some hon. gentlemen declining to support this budget. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) and the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler).

Mr. FORKE: There is the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond).

Mr. GOULD: Yes and the hon. member for Brantford. We have listened for two or three weeks to the lamentations which have gone forth from the sponsors of the protective interests in Canada, as to what would happen if