

they carry out their own policy and fulfil their own pledges they will not be entitled to support? Had that been done, what would have been the result? We never should have had a budget such as this: so my hon. friends must bear the full responsibility for the nature of this present budget.

Mr. W. G. ERNST (Queens-Lunenbourg): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the first part of the speech of the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell) with some approval, but when he reached the latter part of his remarks I knew he was voicing the extreme views of the west. It will be my purpose, Sir, to voice not the extreme views of the east but the views of the extreme east, and to discuss them not in an abstract manner in relation to the tariff in general, but in so far as budget changes affect the industries and the natural resources of that portion of Canada from whence I come.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I might say that I was voicing the views expressed by the government in the west.

Mr. ERNST: Then the government expressed an extreme view in the west.

It seems to me that the internal management of the country and the internal functions of a government in relation to the country to-day divide themselves largely into three groups. First of course there is the maintenance of law and order; then comes the conduct of the various departments of government and the collection of revenue, and lastly what you might class under the general heading of conducting the government for the benefit of the people, particularly bearing in mind under that heading the development of trade and our natural resources. In a country such as Canada, a young country blessed abundantly by nature, it would appear that this latter in itself is a gigantic task, and one of the most formidable which would be undertaken by any government. It is idle for the Minister of Finance to come before parliament and boast that this is a year of prosperity, seeking to prove it by quoting trade figures for this year in comparison with the figures for 1920 or any other year; many factors affect trade conditions, which in turn affect our revenue. Providence is one factor; world economic conditions are another, and lastly and possibly the least important of all, we have the policies of the government. Before these figures assume any particular importance it behooves the Minister of Finance or anyone talking glibly about the prosperity which this government has achieved for the country to show just how the government brought about

[Mr. Campbell.]

the prosperity referred to. What particular items in its policy does it indicate as working for the general prosperity of Canada during the past seven years? Look the policy over item by item; consider the tariff changes. In so far as the whole tariff schedule is concerned the changes are trifling and insignificant. Surely it cannot be said that this government, by its tariff changes has so lowered the cost of living or the cost to the primary producer that it has increased the prosperity of the country. Take the trifling changes in the rate of taxation. Can anyone point to an instance where those changes have enabled one individual to stay in this country or one industry to remain in operation? Consider the immigration policy. Surely the government does not point to that as one of the factors contributing to the prosperity of this country, because looking at it for the last seven years we find that it has been the most ghastly failure in the history of that department. While we are bringing settlers in by the thousands, our own people in greater numbers are leaving the country. Then to what policy of the government shall be ascribed this prosperity? Is it because of economy? Surely not, because each year we find our expenditures increasing. What is left? To what features of its policy do hon. gentlemen opposite point in order to prove that the prosperity is the work of this government?

There is a better test, a really accurate way of measuring these things, and it is this: Are we developing the natural resources of this country to the maximum compatible with world economic conditions and with the preservation of these resources over a period of years? Are we developing in Canada a prosperity which will prevail in each of the provinces and will be effective from coast to coast? That is the true test to be applied in determining whether or not Canada is prosperous, and any government which cannot answer that question in the affirmative must be regarded as derelict in its duty to the people.

Much has been said during the last year about national prosperity and about national unity. We have witnessed also a great deal of pageantry. Pageantry is all very well, and I for one do not deplore it, but it seems to me that the only sure foundation for national unity in this country is to have such policies for the development of the resources of each province as will make the people of that province prosperous and contented and imbue them with an abiding faith in the destinies of Canada. Unless we make the people of each province prosperous and contented they