

it to the country to tell us wherein, if in office, he would improve the situation. I notice that he has in the name of his party given out a manifesto,—I referred to it a little earlier to-day,—as to changes in the tariff which he thinks are all-important. I do not know just what his reason was for issuing that manifesto at this particular time. Probably recalling the majority of 121 registered against his party's amendment last year, he felt it would save him the necessity of moving any amendment in his speech on the Address this afternoon, seeing the subject is on the order paper and therefore cannot be dealt with in that way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not issued any manifesto. I give notice of a resolution on the order paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sorry, I was judging by the way in which the notice appeared. The subject matter I refer to appeared in the evening press the day before parliament opened and the day before the order paper was printed. What I saw in the order paper was a reprint. I apologize if I have spoken wrongfully of it as a "manifesto"; it did seem to me that the manner in which it was issued and its length gave it more or less that complexion, in fact, I think it was so referred to by his own press. However, all that my right hon. friend suggests, in the light of the criticism he has made this afternoon is that the national situation is to be improved by increased taxation. He calls it protection, meaning thereby increased tariff, but I hope this House and the country will not forget that a tariff is a tax, no matter by what other name one may seek to describe it and that higher tariffs mean increased taxation. My right hon. friend contends, as nearly as I can gather, that what should now be done to help meet the condition under which the country is labouring as a result of the heavy legacies of debt to which it has fallen heir in recent years, is to increase taxation, and increase it all around. Apparently he not only wishes to increase the protection afforded to manufacturing industries—I think that is what he says should be done—but he suggests that agriculture should be protected in a similar manner. I am sure my agricultural friends will find a lot of consolation in that thought, particularly, when they realize that their commodities are sold in world markets where prices are determined regardless, for the most part, of conditions in any particular country. Then he suggests that certain industries—the coal industry, I think—should be further protected. I do not think he mentions other branches of mining or lumbering, and he does

not mention the fishing industry. I do not know whether he intends to leave that out; perhaps he will tell us when he comes to the discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He did mention that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I apologize; he did mention it, my right hon. friend in mentioning these particular industries clearly has in mind the protection of special interests. The fault I find in his programme is that there is an absence—at least, I am unable to discover the presence—of any concern for the one class to which every man, woman and child in this country belongs, namely, the consuming public.

Mr. BOYS: Are workers not consumers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Workers are consumers, yes, when in the capacity of consumers, but in that capacity protection is of no service to them, it is a detriment. My right hon. friend said this afternoon that he was unable to discover the necessity in the Address for any mention of the cost of living. It was natural he should make that remark. Clearly in what he has expressed he has not had in mind the great body of the consuming public in this country. If he is not exclusively concerned with these special interests, why does he not take some steps to protect the professional classes? My hon. friend (Mr. Boys) belongs to the professional class—

Mr. BOYS: They do not need it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, my hon. friend is very fortunate. I think in that respect he differs from most members of the professional class.

Mr. BOYS: I do not think my right hon. friend needs it either, does he?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He needs it very much; I am sorry to have to say I cannot agree with my hon. friend. If protection is to be worthy of the name, it should have regard for the interests and well being of the great body of the people as a whole, not merely for the special interests. It should include protection of members of the professional classes—which include lawyers, doctors, teachers, preachers—also for those who make up the trading public; those engaged in wholesale and retail trade; for the great body of civil servants, throughout this country; clerks in shops, stores and offices and for the women and children who have to be provided with the necessities of life, with food and clothing, in a word it should have equal regard for all classes of the community. It is for that reason that the government takes the position