

no question whatever now where my hon. friends to my right stand on the question of the tariff.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There never was.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, to be quite frank, when I was listening to the speech of my right hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, yesterday afternoon, I had a doubt where he was going to come out on the question. But he evidently got some inspiration overnight and now he stands absolutely and flat-footedly on the principle of protection and not the tariff as we have it to-day. If there is any meaning in the words of my right hon. friend, they mean that if he is again returned to power and the party he leads resumes the reins of office in this country, there is no further chance of reductions in the tariff, but there is a certainty that the tariff will go up. My right hon. friend also had some criticism to offer of members of the Progressive party for having expressed different views on the tariff. Well, I presume that he will stand by the utterances of his own followers on this question. Only the other day, on May 12, the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Hubbs), speaking from his seat in the House had this to say on the tariff:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am entirely opposed to the budget. Let me emphasize again, what we must have in this country if we are going to build up Canada, is a good constructive tariff. If I had the framing of it I would say put on a tariff so high that nobody could fly over it with an aeroplane and so deep in its foundations that a submarine could not dig under it.

Now there is the real Simon-pure gospel of protection. I do not know how far my right hon. friend agrees with that, but I can tell him that the gospel that he preached this afternoon will not find a very favourable reception in that great part of Canada that lies west of the Great Lakes. But if the government's policy means anything, as enunciated by the Acting Minister of Finance, and as elaborated by the Prime Minister this afternoon, it means this, that the fiscal policy of this country, so far as the present government is concerned, is to be shaped in the future as it has been shaped in this budget, upon the principle of developing the great natural wealth of this Dominion. Now that, it seems to me, is a distinct step in advance, and I will endeavour to show why a little bit later.

Some reference has been made in the debate to the Liberal platform of 1919. Well, I remember reading the press descriptions of that great convention, at which were assembled delegates from every constituency in Canada. They gathered here in Ottawa

from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and it was not the leaders of the Liberal party at that time who were making the platform of the party. That was a democratic convention, so far as my recollection goes, and so far as my reading of newspaper reports of its proceedings is concerned, and that convention, embracing some seven or eight hundred delegates from all over this Dominion, sat down in consideration of a course of public policy. Whether the government that was elected in 1921, and which my right hon. friend now leads, has up to the present lived up to that platform or not, I think they may justly claim that in the present tariff proposals which they have brought down they have at any rate made a step in that direction.

Why do I offer a word of commendation of this budget? Because this budget recognizes the position of agriculture in this great Dominion. I have advocated in this House on several occasions before—I advocated it during the election of 1921 in every constituency, I think, in which I spoke—that a sound fiscal policy for Canada was a policy which would develop the natural wealth of the country, which would not endeavour to foster and stimulate, at the expense of the great masses of the people, artificial industries that were unsuitable to the development of this Dominion. Sir, I believe that that policy is sound to-day, and sounder to-day than it has ever been before. Our protectionist friends argue that we should be a great manufacturing country, that we should manufacture our own raw materials in Canada and export the finished product abroad. I have no fault to find with that. But what value is a protective tariff in the development of manufacturing industries based on the natural resources of this country when we produce from these resources away and above what we can possibly consume at home? I ask what value is a protective tariff to an industry of that kind? What value is a protective tariff, to the great pulp and lumber industry of this country? Take the figures of our exports and they are growing almost every year in that particular industry. What value is a protective tariff, for instance, to the flour milling industry of this country? We export hundreds of thousands of barrels of flour every year from Canada. What benefit is it to a meat packing establishment? What benefit is it to any of the great industries that are based on our natural resources? It is of no benefit. But where has the protective tariff been invoked in Canada, where has it been used? It has been used in building up or creating industries in Canada the major portion of which depend