

in he speaks of "consistent protection," I am sorry he is not in his seat to-night, because I did want to wish him all the joy he can anticipate in telling the people of the Maritime provinces—who are depressed and sometimes discouraged as a result of half a century of the experiment of high protection—that "consistent protection" is the panacea for all their economic ills. He came up here as a new recruit with all the prestige which accrued to him from being a Tory representative from the Maritime provinces—they are so scarce—and with the tumult of his by-election still ringing in his ears, he propounded the doctrine that consistent protection is the cure for the economic ills of the Maritime provinces, I hope he will enjoy all the favour he shall find in the eyes of his people when he goes back and tells them a story so old, so ridiculous and so well disproved by weary decades of painful experience,

Now, Mr. Speaker my proposition is that a genuine national policy of tariff reform must assert the principle that freer trade is essential to the welfare of the nation as a whole, that the tariff must be regarded purely as a means of raising public revenue, and must proceed to the attainment of these objects by degrees. Protection in the best sense of the word is neither a national blessing nor a truly national policy, because it ignores the natural sequence of industries. What is that natural sequence? What is the business of a great and young country like Canada? Is it not in the first place to develop its primary industries, to see to it that there is a fair economic condition obtaining amongst the farmers, the miners, the fishermen and the lumbermen? They were here first. We have millions of acres of cultivated land: How many of them were selected by the hardy tillers of the soil with any regard to the nearby location of some so-called home market? In some cases there may have been such choices, but in the aggregate the farmers of Canada ignored the question of home market, realizing full well that they had to depend for a return for their products upon the unfettered market of the world. The farmer wants to be let alone. He realizes that he must sell his products in open competition with the world. The protectionist says to him. "You shall not buy what you wish in the open market; we are going to make you swallow protection and make you pay an inflated price for what you have to buy." The more healthy the condition of the primary industries the greater will be the field for the development of the secondary industries. When you attempt to

[Mr. Putnam.]

induce too premature a development of the secondary industries, at once you inflict harm upon the primary industries, increase the cost of living and make it more difficult for those engaged in the primary industries to get their products ready for such market as there is, the surplus product being destined for export to the market of the world.

We are told, and correctly told, that one of the great hopes for the future of Canada is multiplied immigration. It has been agreed by all parties and by all governments that our immigration should consist of selected agriculturists, of those who can make a success of farming—bona fide farmers who will stay on the land. My Conservative friends agree with me in that as well as my Progressive and Liberal friends. It has been the tenor and tune of the speeches of those to your immediate left, Mr. Speaker, in this debate that the welfare of farming depends upon the protection of the secondary industries. I would ask hon. gentlemen to your left if they think we should modify our propaganda among prospective immigrants in the congested parts of Europe? Dare we put a rider in our immigration propaganda to the effect that the ultimate success of agriculture in Canada depends upon whether or not a high protective tariff is maintained? I challenge my hon. friends opposite to this test of their honesty and sincerity, when they say that farming is dependent upon the protection of secondary industries. Dare they, in the light of common sense, say that the immigrants should be warned that if protection is whittled away in Canada the success of farming will go with it; that if we adopt a purely revenue tariff or aim at the goal of free trade, the field for farming in Canada will be over?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I accept the challenge, and I say yes.

Mr. PUTNAM: The hon. gentleman thinks we should make that change in our immigration propaganda?

Mr. RYCKMAN: If you say that this country shall not have a protective tariff that will reasonably protect industry, then the farming community will suffer and we have no reason to ask immigrants to come here and undertake farming.

Mr. PUTNAM: Will my hon. friend tell us what sort of tariff would reasonably protect industry, to use his own phrase?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I have spoken once in the budget debate, but I hope I may not have to speak again. I can only reply by asking my hon. and esteemed friend to answer the question that I put to him before, and I hope