

foodstuffs for her people, then she would have to get control of enough land to be able to feed her own people. Once she embarked upon that policy of aggression, in order to build up her military machine and her armaments she had still further to cut down her imports, so that she would have the necessary foreign exchange to buy the commodities required for her armament program. So we have Germany embarking upon her present policy of restricting imports of foodstuffs.

Economists all over the world foretold that very thing. It was foreseen by President Woodrow Wilson in his fourteen points, when he said that if the separate new nations were established in Europe, provision should be made for low tariffs between them. So the thing that has been foreseen by economists since 1918 and 1919, when the high tariff people of the world demanded and obtained higher tariffs, has come about; and to-day, I believe one of the reasons why the world is once more facing war is a result of an economic policy which sought to sell but would not buy.

That affected us in western Canada, Mr. Speaker, that high tariff policy of those who sought to protect secondary industry in this country. The countries of Europe, which would have been glad to get our foodstuffs, were not permitted to buy them. Our markets were sacrificed on the altar of economic nationalism. The farmers of western Canada are the victims of the high tariff policy which has closed our markets to us; and the farmer on the western plains, who has been placed upon the verge of bankruptcy by the considered protective tariff policy of this country, is now entitled to come to this government and say, "In the distress in which you have placed me I am entitled to defence and protection."

Those are the two branches of the tariff question: the increasing burden placed upon the farmer in higher prices, and the destruction of his markets brought about by deliberate tariff policy; and by deliberate governmental policy must the farmer be protected as a result.

In addition, there was the monetary policy, under which a deliberate endeavour was made to keep our money on a parity with that of the United States. The inordinate increase in tariffs brought about by the previous government—the Bennett government—was put into effect deliberately in order, among other purposes, to cut down our imports from the United States so that our dollar could be kept pretty well on a parity with the dollar of that country. And that was done in the face of repeated requests from

representatives of farming communities that it be not done. The then premier of Saskatchewan, the present Minister of Agriculture in this government, on behalf of the Liberal party of Saskatchewan asked that our money be kept more or less on a parity with the money of our main customer, England, in order that when we sold a bushel of wheat for, say, four shillings we would be able to exchange that money here for about one hundred cents instead of, as was the case at one time, getting something under eighty cents.

I have had the figures from the bureau of statistics in that regard. First of all, I asked for the figures showing what would have happened if we had maintained parity with sterling. Then I asked for the figures indicating what would have happened if we had done as Australia did and kept our money at a discount compared with English money. I will just take time to give the results of the latter. If we had followed the monetary policy that was adopted by the government of Australia, our producers of wheat alone would have received \$229,000,000 more than they did between 1930 and 1936. The policy that was followed in this country represented a definite effort on the part of the federal government to maintain a position whereby it, corporations and others could more easily pay debts in the United States. That was the reason given by the Prime Minister of Canada at that time. Whether or not the policy was wise for that reason is not for me to say at this distant date in this debate. I do say, however, that it was the considered policy of the government, designed to help us pay our debts in the United States without regard to the way in which it bore upon our farmers on the western plains. Is it any wonder, then, that the farmers of the west say now, "You have destroyed our markets. You have permitted us to be exploited to the extent of \$47,000,000 a year. By your monetary policy you have taken away from us \$229,000,000 in a period of about four years. Having done all this, we are now entitled to have you stand behind us, as part of this Dominion of Canada." That is one of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to draw to your attention.

There is another point, and this is something I would say to hon. members from eastern Canada. When western Canada was set up, the immigration policy of the country was dictated by the federal government at Ottawa. Even in 1905 when the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were established, the dominion for 25 years namely until 1930 very carefully kept control of the natura!