

state my own opinion. I believe that as long as a protective tariff is maintained, whether high or low, the protected manufacturer ought to be regarded as a trustee, and held to a strict performance of the trust. The conditions are that he shall make and sell good articles at a moderate price and pay fair wages—in other words, that there shall be no profiteering and no sweating. I lay stress on the latter point because I regard the producer as more important than the product, because there is no benefit to the country in a mere numerical increase of the working population without a high standard of living.

A third condition is that the tariff shall be moderate, because in that way only can we ensure stability and national unity. We have two provinces, Ontario and Quebec, which are highly industrialized, and in which a movement for a high tariff might meet with success. We have, on one side of them, the Maritime Provinces, where the complaint is made that the existing tariff is too high, that the Maritime people bear its burdens and receive no proportionate share of its advantages. You have on the other side the Prairie Provinces in which the prevailing opinion is for a lower rather than a higher tariff. You want a united Canada. You must seek to reconcile these differences.

When the tariff of 1879 was introduced it was called a National Policy. It was an excellent name; and if it does not accurately describe the tariff which was then introduced or succeeding tariffs, it does, in my opinion, describe the tariff which we ought to have. It ought to be truly national, and it ought to be adapted to the Canada of 1926, not to the Canada of 1879. The difference, I need hardly say, lies in the new Canada that has arisen West of Ontario since that time. In 1879 the Prairie West was negligible as to population and negligible as to production. To-day it has a population of about two millions, and it is one of the famous granaries of the world. The Western point of view differs from ours, and to reconcile the two is a real problem of statesmanship. Some years ago statesmanship was required to prevent a cleavage on racial and religious lines between Ontario and Quebec. Happily, owing to the wisdom of our statesmen and the good sense of Canadians, that difficulty has been overcome, or at least has disappeared for a time. Our task is to prevent a cleavage on economic lines between East and West, or, to speak more accurately, between the highly industrialized Provinces of Ontario and Quebec on the one hand and the Maritime Provinces and the Prairie West on the other.

Hon. Mr. LEWIS.

The same motive of promoting national unity lies behind those parts of the Speech in which other concessions are made to the Maritime Provinces and to the West, including rural credits and completion of the Hudson Bay Railway for the West, and, for the East, an effort to encourage the movement of grain to Canadian ports, and a commission to enquire into the grievances of the Maritime Provinces. I am aware that the charge may be made that these are concessions made merely for political support. But they arise out of conditions which must be faced by any party undertaking to govern Canada. They are among the inherent difficulties of administering the affairs of a large and sparsely populated country. I prefer to assume that any support given to them by any party is sincere, and I propose to consider them on their merits, and without imputing wrong motives to any party.

Three paragraphs in the Speech relate to the subject of immigration. Everyone agrees that the crying need of the country is more population. It is speaking well within the bounds of moderation to say that we have here territory and resources capable of maintaining a hundred million people, instead of less than nine million. In the Speech it is intimated that special efforts will be made to encourage settlement on the land. Above all things we need in our new population the pioneer spirit which animated the settlers of Upper and Lower Canada in the old days. Those early settlers, under conditions far harder than ours, struck out into the wilderness and laid the foundations of the Canada which we enjoy to-day. We need above all, in both urban and rural immigration, the resourceful man, the kind of man who is not only willing to work, but capable of finding work for himself; and if we can find such men, I should not ask too many questions as to the part of Europe from which they come.

We need in this country a more assertive Canadian spirit. Canadians have done great things, but they are a little disposed to be too modest about their own achievements. We hear a great deal about the danger of Americanization. The safeguard against that is not anti-American prejudice, but a stronger, more distinctive and more assertive Canadianism. As grown men and women we ought to feel confident in our own ability to judge what is good and what is bad in American customs and ideas, and to reject or assimilate or modify them according to our own judgment.

Such is my own faith in Canada and Canadians that I have no fear as to the outcome of the unusual political situation with which