

complain very bitterly about the iniquity of foreign countries imposing tariffs which prevent them from getting their goods into those countries. That is a condition that may exist for some time. Then, take the country where we have an open market. In the United States we have an open market for at least two commodities manufactured in Canada, namely boots and shoes and farm machinery, and yet we find that our Canadian manufacturers who have had the benefit of this protective tariff for forty years are not yet able to compete in the largest and most profitable market in the world which is open to them. For that reason, I say it is folly to spend any time encouraging new manufacturers, especially by artificial means. I think the minister has made a mistake in including in his budget this year provision for new duties. I take as strong exception to that as I do to the proposal to bonus new industries. I think industries in Canada should be established only on the basis of their own economic strength. My view is, first, that the government should have set their faces firmly against these demands for new duties and demands for bonuses; and secondly, that they should have considered, not merely the manufacturers of eastern Canada, but the producers of Canada as a whole as well. One would assume from the speeches which have been delivered in this part of the House that the fiscal policy was designed for the benefit of only one class of people, and my complaint against this budget is that it entirely neglects the other class of people.

There has been a good deal said about the question of sectionalism in Canada. This has been spoken of by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and by some members on this side of the House. And it is a serious question, much more serious than many members of this House are willing to recognize. So far as the west is concerned, it is reflected in practical solidarity by one party in this House, a party not connected with either of the two principal and old political parties of this country. That solidarity means something; it means not merely Progressivism or Farmers' party, or anything of that sort, but it means that there is a sense of a real grievance out there, a sense that a wrong is being done to the population of that territory, about 2,000,000 people, who think alike to the extent of probably eighty or ninety per cent. What has been done towards examining the source of their complaints? We hear a good deal of discussion about various things. Some hon. members on this side of the House have said

[Mr. Hudson.]

"Why do you talk so much about tariff? You have far greater reason to grumble about freight rates and transportation costs? The tariff does not mean so much in dollars and cents." I would just remind those gentlemen that a tariff is a tax, and an unjust tax means a good deal more than the money exacted. The feeling of injustice is a feeling which produces a great many results that one does not care to contemplate. Hon. members will remember that it was a tax of something like twelve shillings imposed on one John Hampden that ended in the loss of the head of King Charles I. The unjust tax has a psychological effect which many exactions in other ways do not have, and that is something which governments of both political parties have failed to recognize. The situation in western Canada in regard to the tariff is different from that in eastern Canada in one respect, at least. In western Canada we produce, generally speaking, one commodity, namely wheat. That is the great source of wealth there. The total value of wheat and wheat flour for export, which is practically all produced in western Canada amounts to \$312,000,000—one-third of the total exports of Canada.

The people who produce that get no benefit from the tariff, though they bear the burden. And that is the reason why they complain; that is the reason why they will complain until some satisfactory adjustment is made; and that is the reason why I say that the government in this instance has failed in its duty in not considering the peculiar position of those people out there. Some of us out there realized the situation; some of us believed that a compromise might be found in the Liberal platform of 1919. We believed that that might be found acceptable to the people of western Canada in regard to that particular question. As far as one can judge from the words of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), there is no hope now of those portions of the plank of the Liberal platform being carried out by the present government. That being so, I feel compelled to vote against the government's proposals in this case.

Mr. J. L. STANSELL (East Elgin): Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of diffidence that I, as one of the "children of this world" attempt at this time to offer any criticism of the budget, presented by a party that style themselves "the children of light." I can take comfort only in the fact that I have long held the view that saints are created as a result of deeds done in the body, and not as a result of any assertions on their part.

In common with others who have preceded me, I feel that I must extend sincere con-