

adroit circumvention, but the new and shining pennies of a promise fulfilled, of an agreement unbroken, of a tariff policy unsullied, yea, even by a certain element on that side of the house. The member for Lisgar is a man of strong and commanding presence who looks like a likely person to scare the Minister of Finance into relinquishing a vise-like hold on the nickels that are entrusted to his care.

It has often been said that the Progressive movement is an anomaly in Canadian politics; that if they do occupy a place it is only as a sort of left wing to the Liberal party. This view is based on the supposition that both these groups are advocates of the low tariff; the only difference between the two being that while the one group is a little impatient in its attempt to reach that goal, the other believes that we should—

—move forward cautiously with the aid of knowledge of the facts secured by the tariff advisory board toward the goal of making our tariff structure bear as lightly as possible on producer, industry, and the people generally, having always in view the greatest prosperity of all legitimate industries of Canada. The tariff must be made to serve the best interests of the Canadian people as a whole. It must be adjusted from time to time to meet the needs, not of one class or group of industries alone, whichever one that might be, but of our whole economic structure.

Now, what I admire in any person and no less in a government, is courage—the courage of one's convictions. The Finance minister of Canada in concluding the budget speech of last year said:

We are recognized throughout Canada, and we are proud of it, as the low tariff party.

There is an old saying that caution is the better part of valour. If that is true, then I say that the present Liberal government is the most courageous government that Canada ever had. It is cautious to a fault. And why are they so cautious? They are cautious because they believe that is the only alternative. They are cautious because they do not wish to lose their parliamentary quota from Ontario; they are cautious because they do not wish to antagonize protectionist Quebec. I do not believe that hon. members will gainsay me when I emphasize the protectionist temper of our Quebec members. Who but our member from Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Lavigne) had this to say in his speech on the budget last year? I quote from his address on that occasion:

I consider it an honour to follow the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) the only lady member in the House of Commons, although I do not share her views generally and particularly as far as the tariff is concerned. She has told us she is absolutely in favour of a low tariff. Let me assure her

that neither the province from which I come, nor I myself, can sympathize with her in that regard. We are in favour of protection for industry. We do not believe in a low tariff. I am glad to have an opportunity to-night to state my views on the tariff question. I am pleased to see that the budget contains no items of reduction.

I have spoken of courage. I believe I must take those remarks back after reading the above quotation. The member for Quebec-Montmorency is very brave in bearding the lion in his own den; but at the same time he is throwing caution to the winds.

No, we are not Liberals. We are a separate entity called the United Farmers' Association. We believe in low tariff, and it is our duty to jack up the Liberal party every once in a while and remind them constantly of their duties in that regard. Like Atlas, we have been holding the world on our shoulders for ages—a thankless task of which there should be some recognition. Now, it has been our fate that we have to sit on this side of the house with hon. members who uphold the doctrine of protection. Owing to the fact that we often sit, talk, and smoke together in the lobbies we have come to love each other almost to the point of brotherly affection. I also wonder whether it has not been by the same token that the Liberals and the Progressives kiss each other's cheeks on that side of the house. Notwithstanding our congeniality in some matters I am sorry however that in matters of policy over here we must disagree. I hope that our differences in this world will be reconciled when we pass off to a better world.

High protection is not the doctrine of the United Farmers' Association. We do not think it is a good thing for a dominion such as ours with its preponderating agricultural industry and among whose constituent provinces there are such wide and glaring differences of interest in this matter. It appears to me that at best protection is an expedient to which the Tories would like to resort to safeguard our industries against foreigners who might unfairly injure them; at worst it is a form of domestic robbery which is very obnoxious when it goes so far as to rob the state to enrich the individual; it is based on a bad principle when importation is forbidden in order to prevent reasonable competition; and finally it is only justifiable when the taxes which it imposes are made available for the needs of the national treasury.

I think we on this side of the house would be very illogical if we did not support a low tariff doctrine. Indeed we must either hang together on that tenet, or hang separately when we get back home.