

statute books in 1879 and continued from that time up to the present, with some few slight changes. From 1879 to 1896 we had a protective policy. That great statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, whose memory still lives in the hearts and minds of the masses of the people of this country—he and his friends opposed that policy when in opposition, but when they came into power they adopted it and continued it, and when Sir Wilfrid Laurier went out of power in 1911 he left a higher tariff than had been in force when he came in.

What I want to impress upon the House is this: Canada is a young and growing country, a country of great opportunities; it only needs development. We have everything that any country could desire, but we must have a sound, sane protective policy that will give support and protection to our industrial concerns all over the country. Those who invested capital in our industrial enterprises did so under a protective policy and in the belief that that policy would not be tampered with practically every day in the year. But what do we find now?—and I have particular reference to my own county. There we have two large mills closed down, one in the hands of a receiver. That four-storey mill is filled with the most up-to-date machinery that money can purchase for the purpose of producing for this country goods of the very best quality at prices that will meet the competition of the world. But what has this government done? As I say, in 1922 and 1923 they increased the British preference, which permitted foreign goods to flood our domestic market and drive our people out of business. Is there any sense or reason in this? I do not think there is. While the United States has built up a tariff wall so high that no outsider can get a look-in, we have been reducing our tariff protection, thus disorganizing our business and driving our people across the line. In my opinion we ought to have a fair and substantial protective policy that would prevent the United States or any other foreign country from dumping their surplus production here while we are not permitted to do business with them. We must trade on the principle of dollar for dollar, else we cannot live. This jug-handled policy is no good for Canada.

I hope I have made myself clear. I offer no criticism of the government except from a business standpoint. I believe they are on the wrong track. When I heard the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) the other day deliver his budget, which his colleague the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) later termed the "death knell of protection," I thought: Well, if that great man, Sir

[Mr. Preston.]

Wilfrid Laurier, was here we would never have heard any such doctrine as that enunciated in this House. Because he was a protectionist, he knew the value of protection, and therefore he continued the protective policy up to the time he went out of office in 1911.

I know of only one remedy for the present condition of affairs. When the time comes that the government must appeal to the people—and the appeal may come sooner than some of us anticipate—when it does come, Sir, in my humble opinion the great and independent electorate, irrespective of party ties, will march to the polls with that sacred ballot in their hands and there deposit them, not for the purpose of retaining this minority government in power, but on the contrary, Mr. Speaker, to drive them out of power and put in power the most outstanding and capable man in the public life of Canada to-day—and that man is the Right Honourable Arthur Meighen.

Mr. L. P. BANCROFT (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, many hon. members are repeatedly advising the western farmer to discontinue his agitation for lower tariff burdens, lower transportation costs and the completion of the Hudson Bay railway, and to turn his attention to mixed farming. They tell him that therein lies the solution of his troubles. For instance, the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) who comes from a district noted for the production of canned salmon, said a few days ago: Let the western farmers throw away their can-openers and get down to mixed farming. Other hon. members have suggested that we might emulate the example of the great mixed farming province of Quebec. Now, these statements show an absolute lack of knowledge of farming conditions in western Canada, and they are both false and misleading, as I shall endeavour to prove in the short space of time which I plan to take up this afternoon.

I have before me a comparison of the live stock production of Manitoba and Quebec for the past year, 1923:

		Year 1923	
LIVE STOCK AND DAIRY PRODUCTS—QUEBEC AND MANITOBA			
Horses			
Quebec..	361,651 or .145	per capita
Manitoba..	362,407 or .604	" "
Cattle			
Quebec..	1,781,751 or .75	" "
Manitoba..	691,711 or 1.15	" "
Sheep			
Quebec..	822,997 or .35	" "
Manitoba..	93,162 or .15	" "