

We have on this side of the House 116 members, and every one who has spoken so far has said that he was elected to this House on a protective platform; that the tariff, and the tariff alone, was the main and the supreme issue in his constituency. That being the case, and with 116 members who received a popular majority of the votes to the extent of over 200,000 on the 29th of October, if that vote can be interpreted by members on this side of the House it is a mandate to push the King government from power in the same way that that government was pushed by popular sentiment to the polls on the 29th of October last.

As time goes on, it becomes more apparent every day and in every way to every member of this House how hopelessly incompetent and helpless the present administration is. It was claimed a few days ago by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) that we were obstructing the government. Is not that in itself an admission of weakness? If the government have a mandate from the people of this Dominion and from this House to carry on the government and put a certain definite policy into operation, then why not put that policy into operation? Why not bring down their legislation? Why pussyfoot about it? Why not bring it down and let us judge it on its merits? If the government is incapable, then it should do the same as the individual who is incapable, give way to someone else who is capable. Six weeks at home will not advance the business of the country or help to stabilize the dairy industry that we have heard so much about in the last few days. Business men have maintained for the last four years that business has been crippled by government instability, that there has been certain tinkering with the tariff policy from time to time so that things generally are in a state of uncertainty in which nothing is certain but the uncertainty. Stagnation has followed; business after business has gone out of existence; thousands of our population have left and gone to the United States; we cannot possibly continue along those lines. The minister who declared in this House a few years ago that the death knell had been rung of protection in Canada is still on the treasury benches, and that in itself leaves industry without the confidence that it should have. In these circumstances there is one thing left for us to do, and that is to carry out the mandate of the electors and drive to resignation a government that has lost the confidence of the people. If we sit down on our job, we would be remiss in our duty to the people of Canada, because this country needs stability. Instability comes from preach-

ing one doctrine and practising another. If there is merit in free trade, then why not put it into operation and let us experience some of those wonderful benefits which our Progressive friends to the left speak so much about? I challenge the government to come out and fight on that one issue of the tariff in Canada, and let us settle it once and for all.

A country cannot have a lopsided development. We must develop industry and agriculture side by side; one is complementary to the other. The farmers of Ontario are beginning to realize as never before that their best market is the home market, and they are anxious to see that market developed in Canada. If a man can sell his produce at his own door, without shipping it some three thousand miles away, and thus escape transportation, exchange, and all the other difficult problems that enter into a world transaction, is he not much better off? To whom does the farmer sell in the foreign market? He sells to the man living in the distant city, town or village, who is engaged in an industrial operation of some kind, earning a wage by which he can pay for the farmer's produce which is shipped to his home 3,000 or 4,000 miles distant, as the case may be, from the point of production. Now, would it not be a lot better if instead of shipping that grain and produce 3,000 miles we could transplant that man his industry to Canada and let him buy from the farmer here while we could purchase the products of his industry in our own country and not have to import manufactured articles from foreign lands to the detriment of our own artisans?

This afternoon the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) gave a quotation from President Coolidge with respect to agricultural products. Let me finish that quotation by citing other remarks by the president touching the industrial end. On that point President Coolidge said:

Two very important policies have been adopted by this country which, while extending their benefits also in other directions, have been of the utmost importance to the wage earners. One of these is the protective tariff, which enables our people to live according to a better standard and receive a better rate of compensation than any people, at any time, anywhere on earth, ever enjoyed. This saves the American market for the products of the American workmen.

That is what we want to do in Canada. As early as 1876 the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier declared himself a protectionist, admitting that protection was a matter of necessity for a young nation in order that it might attain to the full development of its own resources. We are protectionists on this side of the House