

down the principle that you must have free trade in Canada, especially in certain commodities.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote the hon. gentleman, and to ask if his stand then is consistent with his stand at the present time. In 1914 a debate took place in the house on the question of tariff. The Prime Minister of the Dominion at that time was pleading that if we admitted farm implements duty free into Canada, the great combines in the United States that were controlling the farm implements in that country would swamp Canada and put our manufacturers of farm implements out of business. On page 1567 of the Hansard of 1914, the hon. member for South Wellington said:

There is a free market in Great Britain, and the trusts and the combines, the tremendous organizations which manufacture agricultural implements in the United States, meet in the free market of Great Britain the manufacturers of Canada, and Canada holds her own.

Of course, Canada can hold its own. Canada has always held it own, especially under the tariff laid down by the present government. And then he goes on:

I desire in a few words to show that the removal, the entire abolition of the Canadian duties on agricultural implements, would not do an injustice to a single manufacturing establishment in Canada.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to have an explanation from the hon. gentleman. Perhaps he has had a change of heart. I should like to know why that change of heart came about in respect to those questions, his views on which I—older, I think, than he is in age, but perhaps not in politics—was so proud to follow when he laid down that principle in the statement I have just read.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does the hon. member desire the answer now?

Mr. VENIOT: No, not just now. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, had his opportunity, and he should have explained to this house his change of heart. But he thought the task was too heavy and he did not undertake it at that time, and I am not going to give him an opportunity now, in my time, to try to retrieve himself.

The acting leader of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, severely condemns this government because imports, he says, are too heavy, and of course he attributes this to want of a higher tariff in Canada. I wish to lay before the house a few figures to show that the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman was not a

correct one. Let us take, for instance, the United States, the highest protected country in the world. I do not think I am making any mistake when I say that. We have it that under their high tariff the United States imported, in 1913, \$1,756,900,000 worth of goods. In 1926—thirteen years afterwards—this had increased to \$4,333,900,000. There is a country under the highest tariff in the world increasing its imports in thirteen years by three hundred per cent.

An hon. MEMBER: How about her exports?

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. gentleman will just have patience I will come to that in a minute. Let us look at Canada, a moderately protected country, but a highly protected country in the first year that I will quote. In 1913 we imported \$659,100,000 worth of goods, and, in 1926, \$993,000,000, an increase of only thirty-one per cent, whereas in the United States, a highly protected country, they imported at a rate of increase of 300 per cent in thirteen years.

My hon. friend interjects a comment about exports. The United States exported in 1913 of domestic products—because that is the best way to deal with the exports of a country to show the effect of its tariff—goods to the value of \$2,448,300,000. But in 1926 that had risen to \$4,711,500,000, an increase of about 100 per cent. What did Canada do, a moderately protected country? Canada in 1913 exported \$436,000,000, and in 1926, \$1,268,000,000, or an increase of 300 per cent as against an increase of 100 per cent in the highest protected country in the world. Those are figures that cannot be gainsaid, and they are, to my mind, sufficient proof to any person who wishes to be convinced that the argument now advanced by the hon. the financial critic of the opposition cannot hold water in comparison with his former views as I have quoted them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal for a moment or two with the speeches of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) during his tour in the maritime provinces. First I will take up his argument on the question of raw material. I find that the leader of the opposition very severely condemned this government because of the too large export of our raw material. If I mistake not, I think he laid down the principle that all raw material should be manufactured at home.

Mr. BENNETT: He did not, Mr. Speaker.