

of Canada, instead of buying a Scribe Hotel in Paris or a Union Club in London, England,—things I am convinced could be done without for years to come,—they would be well-advised to turn their attention to the development of our coal fields and making arrangements whereby this coal could be delivered to all parts of Canada, wherever needed, as cheaply as possible, thereby assisting the people to obtain all the fuel they require. Not only that but at the same time it would stop the sending every year of over one hundred million dollars of good Canadian money to other countries for fuel alone when we have so much of it right here in our own country. I claim that if the government would attend to this at once they would be performing a great service to the people as a whole.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, at this late stage in the debate one finds it difficult to introduce new matter, and this might almost be sufficient justification for closing the discussion. But on paying a visit to my people in the West I find that they are very much interested in the budget and are paying close attention to the varied expressions of opinion that are being delivered upon the floor of the House.

I wish to join other members in complimenting the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) on the generalship which he has displayed in the presentation of his budget. I do hope that a year from now my praise may be just as unstinted as it is at this time. What I have in mind is that the dumping clause can be so interpreted as to nullify all the apparent benefits of the budget. I sincerely hope and trust—using the word “trust” in its fullest sense—that the minister or the government will not exercise the dumping clause too drastically, if they exercise it at all, for there is a fear in the minds of the people that its restrictive features may be unduly enforced.

I have noticed, particularly in the early stages of this debate, that our Conservative friends prefaced their remarks by expressing their appreciation of the Acting Minister of Finance and their regret that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) himself was not in his seat. In explanation of that they stated that had the Finance Minister occupied his usual place in the House he would not have brought down a budget such as the present budget. That is to admit that the Finance Minister is greater than the whole Liberal party, in other words that the part is greater than the whole, which none of us can believe to be possible. The statement of the right hon. Prime Minister that the Finance Minister endorsed this budget was satisfactory

[Mr. McKillop.]

to me, and it must have been satisfactory to our Conservative friends, for since that statement was made they have ceased from introducing their remarks by an expression of sorrow at the absence of the Finance Minister. During the years that I have had the honour of occupying a seat in this House, when the Finance Minister was in his place and introduced the policies which hon. gentlemen now give him credit for perpetuating, I cannot recall that they bestowed upon him the fulsome praise which they now offer in his absence. It is something like writing an epitaph on a tombstone; if they believed the Finance Minister was furthering policies which were beneficial to Canada as a whole, why did they not commend him while he was in the House rather than wait until this late day?

Since 1875 all elections in Canada except two have been fought upon the tariff or economic issues. The two I refer to were the elections of 1908 and 1917. The 1908 election was fought largely on the Transcontinental railway question and the 1917 election was the occasion of the formation of the Union or war time government. Had the government of 1908 devoted their time to a discussion of tariff matters it would have been much better for the people of Canada, whether the election was lost or won, than the making of arrangements in connection with that huge expenditure on railways. However, it is not my purpose to enter upon a discussion of railway matters. I am very much interested, of course, in the tariff question and the few remarks I shall make will be largely devoted to that subject.

In passing, though, I wish to make a remark or two concerning the very able address delivered by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens)—and I am pleased to see that he is in the chamber. The hon. member stated that in his early days he had been a student of Adam Smith, Henry George, and John Stuart Mill, and what puzzles me is how the hon. gentleman, having studied these political economists, could in 1924 support a policy brought into effect in 1878, the National Policy. It does seem strange, Sir, but I have no doubt that I can get an explanation from the hon. gentleman in conversation with him. Since the days of Sir John A. Macdonald agriculture has made the greatest strides of any industry in Canada. It is well known that last year Canada produced the largest amount of exportable grain of any country in the world. Consequently our grain crop is the basis of our national wealth, and from an economic point of view