

sives. We thought the party as then constituted was going too far. That was the position we took at the time. It was found, when we got into the campaign that they were not taking the extreme position respecting free trade which some had indicated they were likely to take. Be that as it may, the point I want to make clear—because of something the leader of the opposition said to-day—is, that the object we had in view in the course of action I am describing was not progressive support but to put before the people of this country what the Liberal party stood for and was prepared to fight for.

As I have said, the Liberals in parliament sought to place before the House and the country their views on tariff revision in the form of an amendment to the budget of the then Minister of Finance. On May 10, 1921 the following amendment was moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's and again seconded by myself. I shall read the whole amendment as it sets out very clearly the essential features of Liberal tariff policy. I would ask the House to recall that it was a resolution moved and in fact drafted by the present Minister of Finance, and to note the emphasis it places upon, first: Reduction in the tariff as the main object to be sought; second, its disavowal of protection as the principle upon which the tariff should be based; third, the aim of our fiscal policy as the encouragement of industries based on the natural resources of the country; and fourth, the reduction of such duties as may be expected to reduce the cost of living, and the cost of the implements of production. The resolution is as follows:

That all the words after the word "that" to the end of the question, be omitted, and the following inserted instead thereof:

The House regrets that, after repeated assurances by the government of an intention to have a revision of the customs tariff, and after a protracted inquiry extending from ocean to ocean by a committee of cabinet ministers, the government have made no proposals for any reduction of the tariff;

That, while recognizing that existing financial requirements of the Dominion demand the maintenance of a customs tariff, the House is unable to concur in the declarations by the government that the tariff should be based on the principle of protection; the tariff is a tax, and the aim of legislation should be to make taxation as light as circumstances will permit;

That the aim of the fiscal policy of Canada should be the encouragement of industries based on the natural resources of the country, the development of which may reasonably be expected to create healthy enterprise, giving promise of enduring success;

That such changes should be made in the customs duties as may be expected to reduce the cost of living and to reduce also the cost of implements of production required for the efficient development of the natural resources of the Dominion;

That, while keeping this aim clearly in mind, the House recognizes that in any readjustment of the tariff

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

that may take place, regard must be had to existing conditions of trade, and changes made in such a manner as will cause the least possible disturbance of business.

There is the Laurier-Fielding tariff; there is a declaration that what should be done in the matter of the tariff is a reduction of the duties on the implements of production in order that the great basic industries might be developed in the manner described. I could quote what I said in the House in support of these resolutions, but I will not take up the time of hon. members in referring to the debate that then took place. The whole trend of Liberal discussion then was that this was the object we were fighting for, this was the aim we had before us.

Not only in the House but throughout the country I had occasion to speak on the tariff policy of the Liberal party. Before the election as well as during the election I spoke in eastern Canada and in western Canada. I not only spoke in eastern and western Canada, but I also wrote one or two articles on the Liberal policy with respect to the tariff. I challenge any hon. member of this House to find in any speech of mine made before the election or during the election a single contradiction of the principles that are laid down in the resolution I have quoted. I state that in all the speeches I made I represented to the people in so many words virtually what I have been saying this evening; and more than that I made it a point of emphasizing in every speech—and this is the truth I desire to bring out—that the Liberal party stood for a reduction of the duties on the articles that would affect the cost of living, and especially on the implements of production in the basic industries of agriculture, lumbering, mining and fishing.

I spoke in Toronto with my colleague and friend, the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Beland), on August 14, 1920. That was the year before the passing of the second resolution which I have just read. Let me give to the House the report contained in the Mail-Empire of Toronto of August 16, which was Monday, of the meeting held at Hanlan's Point, Toronto, on August 14, 1920. This is what the Mail and Empire reports as the Liberal policy as stated at that time: Quoting my words, the paper has the following:

We believe that the time has come, indeed that it is already long past, when a downward revision of the tariff is necessary. In this revision we believe that there should be substantial reductions of the duties on the necessities of life; in other words, on those articles which go to make up the food, the clothing, the shelter of the Canadian people; that certain specific articles required for the purposes of