

this seems to be very largely the purpose of the amendment.

I say you cannot protect the farmer. All he asks is that the other industrialists shall get off his own back. It used to be that those enjoying the benefit of import penalties persuaded the workingman that protection would give him high wages and a full dinner pail. The labourer has already found out that all they care about him is to have plenty of men seeking work at the factory door each morning. They are trying to persuade the farmer that if he would only agree to higher protection for the manufacturer, he would have his own product increased in price by protection. This cannot be done while we are producing for export, and every bit of increase in the tariff must make it harder for the farmer to produce at a price at which he can compete in the world's market. The protectionists in this House no doubt hope to place us in a wrong light with our electors, but we are supporting the government on a programme of legislation of benefit to the agriculturist and the people generally. Indeed, much ridicule has been thrown at this group by the press, by anonymous letters, and by debate in this House; but had the Conservative party been sincere in their criticism of the Australian treaty and their professed concern for the welfare of the agriculturist, they would have attacked the Australian treaty from another standpoint altogether. They would have attacked that part of it which places a duty of three cents a pound on raisins, seeing that the bulk of what we use in Canada comes, not from Australia, but from other countries to which no preference in the tariff is shown. I suppose that Australia will not be able to send us this year more than a one-twentieth part of what we shall need. Whatever we may get from Australia duty free will benefit only the importer or the big dealer; the benefit will not be passed on even to the retailer, much less to the consumer. The strange thing is that I do not hear our Conservative friends attack this part of the treaty, the part that will most affect the manufacturer, by raising the cost of living, and will as well put further out of line the cost of production on our farms. But as long as there is a penalty placed on anything that we have to import, the protectionist advocate always thinks it is all right because he is himself blinded by the prospect of the immediate gain he thinks he will get when the government agrees to tax what he is particularly interested in. Indeed, consistency and fair play are terms that cannot be applied to men advocating a tax on foodstuffs.

The hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Davis) the other day, when purporting to quote me from page 488 of Hansard, was really reading a quotation from Sir Richard Cartwright. But I do not want to apologize for Sir Richard Cartwright; his arguments were unanswerable at the time. I still believe that every kind of protection is robbery, yes, legalized robbery, just as Sir Richard Cartwright said it was, and, indeed, it is quite plain to-day to anybody who looks into the matter that if it was not possible under the system of protection to obtain something for which no return was given, protection would die a natural death in about the time it takes to tell the tale. They say it will look after the unemployment question. It has never done it. They say it will give us a home market. That is only a joke. The hon. gentleman quoted from Hansard showing that the agricultural industry had been subsidized by large sums of money, and he cited some sums paid for travelling expenses of inspectors and others on educational work. How he can call this a subsidy to the industry, I do not know. To pay travelling expenses for inspectors or educational speakers is not subsidizing the industry. I would like to know what he has to say regarding travelling expenses for hon gentlemen going to the ends of the earth to negotiate trade treaties for the sake of other industries. What has he to say regarding the salaries and expenses of prevention officers in every manufacturing country that sends manufactured goods to this country? In the interest of our protected manufacturers there is an army of men following up every shipment of goods made to Canada in order to see that the invoices are not falsified and that the goods are not sold cheaper for export than they are in the country of origin. Indeed, our own preventive service last year cost us between \$300,000 and \$400,000. But can the hon. gentleman point to one dollar the farmer has ever received by enhanced prices on his products on account of the tariff? Is there any product on the farm to which any existing tariff can be applied by way of protection? Is there any commodity the farmer needs to buy that is not affected by trade penalties in the interests of manufacturers? The hon. gentleman mentioned the sum of \$63,646 spent in 1923 for educational work as a subsidy of enormous extent. Why, the bounty paid for the production of crude petroleum alone last year was just equal to that, besides \$2,500 for the administration of that act. The bounty on copper bars and rods paid to one company last year was