

the people. The need for revenue would be a primary consideration instead of protection.

Then in St. John, New Brunswick, as reported in the *Globe* of October 17:

It was to the interest of the country as a whole that the tax on implements of production should be as light as possible. Also the tax on the necessities of life should be light. It was along these lines that the Liberals proposed to revise the tariff.

In St. John, as reported in the *St. John Times* of October 17:

He regarded the platform as a chart of the course that the Liberal party was supposed to take. He would keep the chart before him and with the assistance of his colleagues would take the right course. Conditions had changed materially since the 1919 platform had been framed. There had been changes in the United States tariff. Must we be bound by the actual words of any document? The people would regard him as a madman if he did so. He would have to accommodate himself to conditions and take a common sense view. That would be the same course to take..... It was to the interest of the country as a whole that the tax on implements of production should be as light as possible. Also the tax on the necessities of life should be light. It was along these lines that the Liberals proposed to revise the tariff.

I come now to the province of Ontario. Speaking in Sarnia on November 2, as reported in the *Sarnia Observer*, the day following, I said:

The wealth of the country came from the great basic industries, lumbering, mining, farming, etc., and as all manufacturing was the turning of raw materials into articles of consumption, the Liberal party wanted the implements of production to be taxed as lightly as possible. The same applied to certain classes of necessities of life, such as food, clothing, etc., which should be taxed as lightly as possible. The Liberal tariff proposed that manufacturers should be prosperous because they could get their equipment at reasonable prices while the masses of the people should not be overtaxed in costs of food, clothing and other necessities.

In Sudbury on November 8, as reported in the *Montreal Gazette* on November 9, I said:

The tariff could not be abolished, however, since revenue was needed, but it should be revised from a revenue basis. To increase the wealth of the country its natural resources must be developed and this demanded the removal of taxation as far as possible from implements of production in the basic industries. Necessities of life must also be freed of taxation to the greatest possible extent.

Then at Port Arthur on November 10, as reported in the *Manitoba Free Press Bulletin* of November 11:

The Liberal leader outlining the revenue tariff policy, declared that free trade was impossible, and unthought of at present, and that the Liberal party stood for downward revision, making the tariff bear as lightly as possible on necessities of life and implements of production.

Mr. King declared he had been making exactly the same tariff speeches in all parts of Canada for the past two years.

In Newmarket, in my own constituency, I said on November 22:

The Liberals believed in revising the tariff in a manner to increase production by lightening the burden on implements of production in the basic industries and on the necessities of life.

The report is from a despatch to the *Ottawa Citizen* of November 23.

At Peterborough I am reported in the *Examiner* of November 27, as follows:

Mr. King said that the best tariff policy in the interests of the country was that of the Liberals, which, he explained, was a policy of downward revision; a tariff designed primarily for revenue, which would lighten the burden of taxation on implements of production in the four basic industries, and on foodstuffs.

Again at Pembroke I am reported in the *Montreal Gazette* of November 29, 1921, as follows:

The Liberal tariff policy was unchanged, Mr. King said. He believed in the necessity of downward revision, with reduced taxes on necessities of life and on the implements of production used in the basic industries.

At Gananoque I am reported in the *Ottawa Citizen* of December 1, 1921, as saying:

The Liberal revenue tariff policy would help bring the needed revenue and also increase production in the great industries. Machinery and tools used in the four basic industries of agriculture, lumbering, mining and fishing, and also necessities of life, must be freed from irksome taxations. As far as possible, a Liberal tariff revision, said Mr. King, would be based on the home and its needs.

Now I come to the western provinces: Of my speech at Melville, Saskatchewan, the *Manitoba Free Press* of November 14, 1921, contained the following report:

Mr. King reviewed the platform as put forth by the Liberals, and said that his party stood for downward revision and for relieving of taxation as far as possible—implements of production in the basic industries and necessities of life.

At Calgary, Alberta, I am reported in the *Manitoba Free Press* of November 16, 1921, as follows:

The Liberal party, he declared, stood for a tariff for revenue. This, he believed, was in the interests of all producers and consumers. He also held that duties should bear as lightly as possible on the implements of production in the basic industries and on the necessities of life.

The *Calgary Morning Albertan* on November 16, 1921, contained the following report:

We stand for a tariff for revenue, not to protect monopolies. But we would have the tariff revised for the producers and consumers. The burden should bear as lightly as possible on the tools of production of farm, mine, lumber camps, and so forth, and on the food and clothing of the people.

At Edmonton I am reported in the *Edmonton Bulletin* of November 15, 1921, as follows:

Tariff for revenue only should be the object. The Liberal party was pledged first to reduce the duty on implements of production to the lowest possible