

all amiss to point out the ground on which Adam Smith justified the taking care of industry at home. I ask this house quite seriously this question: is this country to become economically a dependent or an independent community? Are we to find ourselves in such a situation that, at the caprice of a powerful neighbour, for purposes solely selfish and entirely in its own interests, we shall be excluded from our sources of supply? Yet this has happened before. Do my hon. friends realize that in Europe one country has established, and to-day maintains at an annual loss, a factory for the purpose of ensuring that its people shall not be dependent upon foreign supplies as they were during the war? Do hon. gentlemen realize that this particular industry now operates in the Netherlands? Well, is Canada going to find itself in a similar predicament? All we endeavour to do, Mr. Speaker, is by every legislative means within our power, to use the words of a great Englishman, and with the tools that are in our hands, whether they be tariffs, regulations, bonuses, drawbacks, or bounties, to bend our efforts to one purpose and one purpose only, namely, to make the Canadian people a strong and virile nation, developing their own resources to the limit of their ability, and thus become entirely economically independent of foreigners, whoever they may be or wherever they may be found.

I have not the time this afternoon to dwell upon the trade treaties which have been entered into by this government; I cannot indicate the extent to which the government has failed in respect of these agreements. Suffice it to say that every trade treaty which the government has entered into has operated against the Dominion of Canada. There is, perhaps, one exception respecting which there may be some doubt; I refer to the treaty with the Netherlands. But so far as the others are concerned I think the statement I have just made can be accepted without any qualification. We have made treaties with Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Italy and France.

Mr. ROBB: And South Africa.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, and South Africa. And all these treaties have been equally disastrous to Canada. See what happened but yesterday: France raised its duties but we were powerless. We cannot touch ours unless we abrogate the treaty; so the minister told me yesterday. In Australia they increased their tariff; we are powerless. Why? Simply because we were not skilful enough as bargainers; they outreached us; they outgeneraled us. The bargain, so far as they

are concerned, leaves them free to raise their tariff against us while, without abrogating the treaty, we are powerless to touch our tariff as it affects them. Did my hon. friends know that? Do they know that we cannot touch these items without cancelling the treaties we have with these countries? The Minister of Finance was waited upon the other day by a certain delegation—this will reveal his state of mind concerning these treaties—and when he heard a complaint regarding certain items in the schedules affected he remarked, "You did not support me properly with respect to the Australian treaty". It appears, then, that industry is to be punished if it fails to support the Minister of Finance. Is that the law of this country? Is that the way in which Canada is to be governed? If so, clearly our tariff is but a political tariff. Legislation has been introduced, retroactive in its character, for one purpose and one purpose only, and I say that such a thing is improper. It is improper for the Minister of Finance to tell certain people that inasmuch as they did not support his Australian treaty to his satisfaction he will do nothing for them. This, I submit, is anything but a proper frame of mind for the Minister of Finance, whoever he may be; it is not the right attitude for any Canadian minister to take towards the industrial life of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have moved an amendment the affirmative of which we say clearly expresses the attitude of the party to which we belong. Our position is stated in simple, clearcut language. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, let me once more read that amendment:

This house regrets that the measures proposed by the government do not tend to provide increased employment in Canada nor to induce the return of Canadians to their native land, nor to prevent the continued emigration of our people to the United States; and that they make no provisions for the preservation of our domestic markets for Canadian farm and dairy products, nor for the effective development of the natural resources of the country, nor for the abolition of the sales tax by the first of January 1929.

The policy of the Conservative party is to increase employment in Canada, to keep our people here and to induce the return of Canadians to their native land. The evidence given before this high court of parliament by the hon. members who have taken part in this debate proves conclusively that the policies in force at present are not having this effect, and neither are they preventing the continued emigration of our people to the United States.