

has been discussed ad infinitum, and when tariff changes are made we can do nothing but watch closely to see what happens.

I honestly and conscientiously believe that this legislation will not be in the interest of the Dominion as a whole. I admit that the argument for protection is plausible; in fact, it is difficult to combat. It does not matter in what kind of business a person is engaged, he will be deeply interested if offered protection for his industry. Yet, every economic authority of which I have heard agrees that the principle of protection is economically unsound. Some honourable members may say, "We are not interested in theories now; we have to contend with a practical situation." But to my mind it is a fact rather than a theory, that protection such as planned under this legislation is bad. In fact, it seems to me that, as the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen said of some other proposal in another place, this is protection gone mad.

Subsection 1 of section 43 of the Act, as amended, reads:

43. (1) If at any time it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council on a report from the Minister that goods of any kind are being imported into Canada, either on sale or on consignment, under such conditions as prejudicially or injuriously to affect the interests of Canadian producers or manufacturers, the Governor in Council may authorize the Minister to fix the value for duty of any class or kind of such goods, and notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the value so fixed shall be deemed to be the fair market value of such goods.

There is no limit to the powers of the Minister here; if he so desired he could absolutely prohibit the importation of any class of goods, and I think that was admitted in another place. I am not saying that the Minister would do that kind of thing, but it certainly seems to be a tremendous power to put into the hands of an individual—for the Minister will have the real power, although the Governor in Council grants the necessary authority.

It has been said that this legislation will benefit the producer. Will honourable members excuse me for making a personal reference? I have barns full of produce. Will the Minister, by protecting my goods, enable me to sell them at a profit? I say that would be absolutely impossible, for there is no legislation that can be introduced here or in another place that can protect the man who has to sell his goods in the markets of the world.

We often hear it asked, "Why not keep our good money at home and encourage Canadian production?" Well, I should like to ask honourable members if they have seen

much Canadian money floating around in the United States, where we bought \$900,000,000 worth of goods last year. They do not want our money over there, and the goods we purchase from them are paid for by our goods—perhaps not directly, but through the complicated economic system which exists. If we pass legislation which will make it impossible for us to buy the goods of other countries, I wonder how we are going to sell our products abroad. If we ship goods to Great Britain we must expect to import certain products from that country. It seems to me that every barrier placed on international trade results in making business conditions in our own country more difficult.

I recently read an article by the Hon. Walter Runciman, in connection with the attempt to force protection upon the Old Country. He remarked that protection seemed to be popular throughout the world to-day. All over Europe the war-ridden countries are trying to build up impassable trade barriers against one another. Mr. Runciman believes that conditions will not improve and people will continue to suffer until such an unbearable situation arises that, in self-defence, countries will have to do away with their tariffs. Once the tariffs are abolished, trade will flow as freely as water, and find its own level. I believe the day is distant when tariffs will be done away with, but I feel that not until then will our unemployment problems be solved. Tariff abolition is an ideal towards which we are striving, and any country that realizes that ideal must surely benefit. Notwithstanding differences of opinion among honourable members on other matters, I think all will agree that Canada has made tremendous strides forward in the last eight or nine years. I think our country was bound to advance irrespective of what party was in power, but it was a proud thing for me, and I think for most Canadians, that Canada had the lowest tariff and yet was perhaps the most prosperous country in the whole world. But we were not content; we wanted a change. The difficulties and troubles we have come through had nothing whatever to do with either high tariff or low tariff.

Some speaker mentioned the conditions in England. I think the honourable leader of the Government was present at a recent meeting at which Mr. Lukin Johnston delivered an address on the problems existing in England to-day. He said that across the south of England, in a great many counties, there was great prosperity; people were living