

blem of Canada. I want to make a suggestion to my hon. friend from North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh), who is interested in designing a new Canadian flag. I would suggest that his flag should show a fine Ayrshire cow against a grassy background, with a group of statesmen looking on admiringly. I think in view of the condition of the dairy industry at this time, such a design would be very appropriate.

Mr. COOTE: Who would be milking the cow?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Someone other than the farmer, probably.

A few days ago my hon. friend from Weyburn accused members on this side of the house of deserting the policies and principles upon which they were elected. May I remind him that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and rather than trying to take the mote out of our eyes, he should be thinking of the beam in his own. Whenever anyone posing as a proponent of protection for the farmer gets up and advocates such a policy in the house, my hon. friend from Weyburn swoops down on him like an avenging angel. He is ready to fight a legion of protectionist devils if they are not in league with the government, but when the manufacturers ask for and secure protection for their products, and we ask for consideration for the consumer, my hon. friend is as mum as an oyster; no one hears a word out of him. He asked one member in this group yesterday why we did not join the consumers' league. I will tell him why I do not join it, and I think this is true of my friends here generally. We are prepared to do our fighting on the floor of this house. We do not want to do it by proxy somewhere else: here is the place to do it. But my hon. friend sits quiet when there is any fighting of that kind to be done in this house, and he excuses himself by saying: just look at what the consumers' league is doing before the tariff board. Mr. Speaker, we in this part of the house are not doing our fighting by proxy somewhere else. We are doing it right here. I want to be fair to my hon. friend, for I know that he is honest, and that his heart is in the right place, but I think he is in a false position; he realizes that he has to answer the crack of the party whip. The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird) and several other speakers yesterday referred to red herrings drawn across the trail in this debate. May I tell my hon. friend from Weyburn that I con-

sider the consumers' league is simply a red herring to distract the attention of the people from the action of its members in this house.

Let me give my hon. friend an illustration, and again I say I wish to be fair to him because I have a very high regard for him. In 1928, the representative of the consumers' league before the tariff board, a gentleman who is employed and paid by the members of the league, wrote a letter in which he referred to the budget of 1928 as the worst budget since confederation. He referred particularly to the fact that Liberal principles were departed from in the reduction of the income tax, and in the regulations applying to the British preference, which had the effect of doubling the tariff on many articles that we import from Great Britain. That is what the representative of the consumers' league said about the 1928 budget. What did the members of the consumers' league in this house do?

Mr. STEVENS: Vote for the budget.

Mr. CAMPBELL: They swallowed the budget as completely and effectually as the whale swallowed Jonah, although in this case it might be more correct to say that Jonah swallowed the whale. I am sorry to have to cross swords with hon. members over there. I really feel rather sorry for them and believe they are entitled rather to our commiseration than to our condemnation. I invite them to come forward to the uplands where the air is pure and sweet. Let them come over here, where there is no party whip, and where a man can express his opinions just as he expresses them back in the country. We shall hear a great deal in the coming campaign about what the consumers' league did. I am more concerned about what the members of the consumers' league are doing in this house.

I have here a newspaper clipping of a speech delivered by the present Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Crerar) at Winnipeg, as reported in *The Tribune* of January 22, 1930, which, I believe, was after he was sworn in as minister. It reads:

Condemning protective tariffs, Mr. Crerar said protection was a fiscal policy which could work out in no other way than by conferring benefits on certain sections of the community at the expense of the others. The principle of protection was not suited to a new country. "We can't build up eastern cities at the expense of western cities without developing jealousies, suspicions and strife."

Noble sentiments those; but what will the Minister of Railways do when it comes to deciding these issues on the floor of this house? That is the acid test—not sentiments expounded out in the country.