

duce the tariff very much below its present level. As I said before, there may be certain cases where the tariff is a little too high, but there are many other cases, and these apply particularly to farm products, where the level is too low. I believe that a measure of protection should be extended fairly to every industry and every class of production in this Dominion. Until we realize and announce to ourselves—it may be necessary for some of us first to convert ourselves—that protection is necessary, and until we announce to the world that protection fairly distributed is the settled policy of this country, Canada will never enjoy the prosperity and progress to which she is entitled.

I know that very frequently we are met with the argument, in support of reductions in taxation, that we must have trade, that we cannot sell unless we buy. I want to ask my friends from the west this: Is not trade between Saskatchewan and Ontario or between Manitoba and Quebec just as valuable to the provinces concerned as trade between those western provinces and any states in the American union? And is not this inter-provincial trade of infinitely greater benefit to Canada as a whole? These are questions that I think should be considered; these are facts that I think cannot be disputed. If Canada is made prosperous by a protective policy such as that, if we announce to the world once for all that Canada is a protective country and will look after the interests of the men and women whom we hope to attract to our shores, if we assure those who have capital to invest that they will be fairly treated and their interests safeguarded if they invest in this country, our problem of immigration will be largely solved. We can spend millions trying to induce people to come to this country, but so long as we have a government that from the ambush of cabinet secrecy snipes here and there at the various industries of this country, and with none knowing where the blow will next fall, there will always be an element of uncertainty and distrust which will drive Canadians to seek employment elsewhere and be disastrous to us in our national progress. If this prosperity and progress comes to Canada as a result of a protective policy, let me say to my friends from the west who have not the same faith in the protective policy that some of us have, they can rest assured that a certain measure of that prosperity will accrue to them. They have since coming to this House, particularly the members from Saskatchewan, shown that they do not lack in aggressiveness, and that quality I am sure will enable them to get their share of the

[Mr. Stansell.]

prosperity that will come to Canada by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy.

This budget has been proclaimed by some sections of the press as a "poor man's budget." It has been said that it is a popular budget. Of course it is a popular budget; it was intended to be. A government that had to attain power by methods such as were resorted to by this government, and knowing the danger in which they stand from hour to hour, realizing the necessity, perhaps I should say the advisability, of an early election, has skilfully prepared this budget with the idea of securing votes and popular support in the country. This explains why many provisions of this budget which were strongly opposed and voted against by members on the other side of the House, including cabinet ministers, last year and in previous years are now being strongly supported by them. The hope is that this budget will be so popular that in the event of the necessity for an election, it will enable them to get back on the treasury benches once more.

Now what are the provisions that make this budget popular? Reduction of taxation is always popular. The methods pursued by this government remind me of those followed by a municipal council, which in a desperate effort to make itself popular will strike a lower tax rate than it should in the hope that prosperity may come in some degree next year and thus prevent an unfavourable showing. There is just one sound reason, Mr. Speaker, for a reduction in taxation, and that is a corresponding reduction in expenditure.

One thing that is designed to make this budget popular and a poor man's budget is the reduction in the income tax, but I would point out that there are a lot of poor men who did not have to pay any income tax, and whom this reduction will not affect. There will be the feeling in the back of their heads that the necessary taxation to make up for this reduction will have to be provided by someone somewhere, and if the man who is wealthy enough to pay income tax is to have his load lightened, somebody somewhere must make up the deficit.

We have been told that this budget is popular because the receipt tax has been abolished. I wonder who put that receipt tax on. This government itself is responsible for that annoying tax, and surely credit is not to be given them now because they are taking away an injustice that they themselves put upon the Canadian people.

We are also to have a reduction in postage. The Post Office Department is one government department that is shown to be in a fairly healthy condition. But the postage is one