

haustive and very interesting address by the honourable member for Boissevain (Hon. Mr. Schaffner). With some parts of his address I should be disposed to agree; with other parts I should not feel like concurring. However, it is not my intention this afternoon to delay the House with any general review of the honourable gentleman's discussion of public affairs, nor, in fact, with any general review of the debate so far as it has proceeded up to this time.

There are one or two observations, however, that I should like to make with reference to the remarks of my honourable friend. If I understood him correctly, he referred to what he called the "privileged class," or the "privileged classes" of this country. Now, I submit, with all deference, that there is no such thing as a privileged class in this country, and that it does not make for the cohesion or the betterment of the country as a whole for any honourable member of this House, or of any House, or, in fact, any person, to endeavour to impress upon the public mind the view that one person is better than another, or that any man has greater rights or more privileges than his neighbour. No person in this country is enjoying privileges over his neighbour. I take it for granted, from the tenor of the honourable gentleman's remarks, that he has in mind the impression that there are people who enjoy privileges under the customs tariff; that is to say that the policy of protection, as we have had it in this country, extends privileges to some people which it does not extend to others. In answer to that, if that was what was in his mind, I want to say that in my judgment his view was entirely erroneous. The National Policy, as we have understood it since 1878, was purely a Canadian policy; designed not merely to assist manufacturing, but to build up the whole country. It applies to every man, whether he be an investor in a manufacturing industry; or whether he be a labourer in a manufacturing industry; whether he be a shopkeeper selling goods to the manufacturer, or a farmer, who finds his ready and profitable market in the manufacturing districts. It does not extend privileges to one more than to another. The National Policy is widespread and benefits every one.

My honourable friend touched upon the question of profiteering. I submit that there is entirely too much general discussion in that regard without any concrete facts being put forward. It may be true, probably it is true, that here and there some men engaged in industry have taken

Hon. Mr. TANNER.

advantage of the situation during the war time, and have gained undue profits. But that cannot be alleged only against the men who are conducting the manufacturing industries of this country. Relatively it can just as truly be alleged against the men employed in those industries. All of us know that during the war, when business was on the upward trend, and when development was going on on a large scale, the workingman was receiving two, or three, or four, or five times the wages he formerly received. I know that in Nova Scotia men were receiving almost fabulous pay. Relatively speaking, they might be called profiteers. The same might be said of the farmers, who were receiving enhanced prices for their products—butter, eggs, hay and grain. But I would not call them profiteers, even although in the eastern part of Canada to-day we have to pay \$15 a barrel for flour, made, perhaps, from grain raised on the farm of my honourable friend. I would not call my honourable friend a profiteer, nor do I think he should so describe the man who makes steel or any other product because he made increased profits.

The West naturally looks upon the manufacturing industries in this part of the country, and, as my honourable friend did yesterday, calls them the "big interests." We in the East look to the West and see this gigantic organization of the grain growers, which has within its bounds a multitude of men, and which, I am told, has very large sums of money invested. We might be disposed to say they are the big interests. I know that their representatives came down the other day to organize in Nova Scotia. They brought the cash box with them, and were ready to dump into the establishment of a newspaper the tidy sum of \$12,500. In the locality in which I live we would have to search, and search again, to raise that sum of money to put it into a newspaper.

Hon. Mr. DENNIS: And then we would fail to find it.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: And they expected the farmers of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to dig down in their pockets to find a further sum of \$12,500.

The view I take is that, instead of endeavouring to widen any breach that may exist, it should be the duty of every man in public life, particularly in this House, to endeavour to bring the West and the East together. We in the East need the flour and the grain of the West; and the people of the West need the products of the