

session at this time to convince you how important I consider this show that I would take a day to attend it," the minister said.

He admits himself that he is important and we have to agree with him. I think his presence here is necessary. I notice, under schedule D, No. 14, that reference is made to bacon and hams coming from Ceylon. A little while ago I referred to hog production and I was told that I was altogether wrong. I have here the press report in the Toronto Globe, showing what the Minister of Agriculture said, at Clinton on September 29:

In regard to prices, the minister said he could make no prophecy on this subject. "But I will tell you this," he added: "Two years ago I sold my hogs; today I am buying hogs."

What does that mean? It means simply, if I understand what the minister is talking about, that the price of hogs will improve and that he is going into hog production himself, and is advising the farmers to do the same. Every farmer at the meeting at which the minister spoke took that meaning from his words. That was what he was advising the farmers to do, to go into hog production. But that is not his only utterance. He has made other statements and I have here a clipping from the Ottawa Citizen of September 16, 1932, in which he is reported to have said:

"The British government has definitely committed itself to a policy of restriction with the object of raising the price of bacon in the United Kingdom," said Mr. Weir today. "If they can carry out this commitment the price of bacon should be higher in Britain within a year. Our farmers, if they wish to take advantage of the advance in prices, should make provision now for it takes 10 months to produce a hog. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on raising the right kind of pigs that produce select bacon. Unsatisfactory hogs which cannot be exported, always tend to depress our market."

In order to assist the farmers the practice started a year ago will be augmented. It provides them with select sows, bred to select boars at the actual cost they would bring at the slaughter houses. The government pays half the freight, and bears the cost of experts who choose the sows at the live stock yards and the other expenses. In this way farmers can get high grade bred sows at very little more than they will get for their under grade ones.

These are definite statements made by the Minister of Agriculture, and any man who understands English surely can take no other meaning from his words than that he is advocating that farmers of Canada go into the production of hogs again. I cannot understand why he should say, as reported at page 1138 of Hansard:

I have not at any time, either before or after the conference, advocated a campaign for in-

creased hog production, whether the price was 2 cents or any other price.

The statements contradict one another, and I leave it to the committee to judge just what he meant.

Article 8 agreed to.

On article 9:

His Majesty's government in Canada will invite parliament to pass the legislation necessary to substitute for the duties of customs now leviable on the goods specified in schedule E the duties shown in that schedule, provided that nothing in this article shall preclude His Majesty's government in Canada from reducing the duties specified in the said schedule so long as the margin of British preference shown in that schedule is preserved or from increasing the rates under the intermediate or general tariff set out in the said schedule.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Consideration of this article will involve taking up the items in the schedule one by one. Before that is commenced, may I say a word as to the chief objection we have to the schedule, considered as a whole. It is that it seeks to raise the tariff still higher and seeks to maintain the tariff at a certain rate over a period of years. That is an innovation so far as this parliament is concerned. I do not think that ever before this parliament has bound itself to maintain a tariff schedule of any appreciable extent if of any extent at all over a period of years. We have already discussed very fully the reasons why such should not for one minute be admitted as a precedent or a correct procedure, but I should like to add to the quotation I gave a moment ago from Mr. Hirst's article in the Nineteenth Century of October, what that distinguished authority has to say in regard to the same sort of thing where it is being done by the British government across the seas. It helps to make clear wherein the position which the Liberal party in Canada is taking is on all fours with the position taken by at least two of the political parties in the old country:

But there is also a grave constitutional objection to making the customs duties of the United Kingdom dependent for a term of years on the will of one or more colonial legislatures. It is an exact inversion of the policy of George III and Lord North, which lost us the American colonies. The colonial assemblies at that time preferred to fight rather than submit to a trifling customs duty on tea which Great Britain imposed.

The present parliament may persist, even in the face of shrinking trade and employment, in its determination to maintain or increase protective duties. But surely it cannot pretend to prevent its successors from touching the taxes which it is about to impose, or the taxes which it has already imposed since it was elected? Earlier in the year Liberals foresaw the danger, and issued a warning in the shape