

province of British Columbia and in every province in which I spoke, from every platform upon which I stood, I took occasion on this subject of the tariff, to refer to the convention of 1919 and the interpretation which the Liberal party put upon the Liberal platform as adopted at the time of that convention. I spoke in terms exactly similar to those which I am asserting at this moment. I made it plain, using indeed, the very simile I have used this afternoon, that if returned to power I should regard the platform as a chart on which was plotted the course the Liberal party was expected to take. I said that I would not seek to follow it literally, that I felt it would be unwise to do so, but that I would seek to bring about me, from the different provinces of the Dominion, men upon whose judgment the country would have reason to rely with confidence and that I would be guided by their collective wisdom in moving in the direction indicated. I also made it clear that whatever the Liberal party might do with respect to the tariff, it would do in relation to conditions existing at the time; and I know I made the further assertion that no established industry in this country operating at that time and which was earning a legitimate profit need have any fear, if the Liberal party were returned to power, that its legitimate business would be injured by any revision of the tariff. That was the position I took throughout the campaign; I took it in every province; and I challenge my right hon. friend and those around him to search the journals of this country from one end of it to the other and bring into this House of Commons, if they can, a single statement of mine, truly reported, that is contrary to what I am saying at this moment.

Now, Sir, I say that that is the pledge by which we are bound; that is the position we took when we appealed to the country. We were returned on that representation and on no other. What we have done in this budget is to carry out the spirit of the platform as laid down in 1919, in the light of conditions as we see them at the present time.

Some of those who sit opposite have referred to this budget as a protectionist budget. What are its features? In the first place, there are in it, so far as tariff matters are concerned, a very large number of reductions in duties. I have in my hand a list of tariff reductions in which some 21 different items have been affected by considerable reductions, apart altogether from the general reduction made through the British preference on all articles. Twenty-one different articles, which I will not detain the House by reading, have

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

been affected by an immediate reduction of duty. Then, as respects all commodities, the British preference has been increased. This is equivalent to a reduction in the customs duty on articles coming from Great Britain of a 10 per cent discount on all goods coming in through our Canadian ports. There again is a further general reduction of duties. But let me point out to hon. gentlemen that this budget must be considered not only in relation to what we are doing at the moment but in conjunction with what we did last year. Last year we made some material reductions in customs duties, some of them with respect to the British preference; and if one takes occasion to study carefully the items that were affected, one will find that as regards goods coming from the Old Country there has been a very considerable reduction in customs duties through an increase of the British preference. I have here a list of items that have been affected by the British preference in a very direct way and to a considerable degree by what we have done this session combined with what was done last year. In some 40 cases which I might cite there have been reductions ranging anywhere from 2 to 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9 per cent increase in the British preference. Among these let us cite the following: take first the case of flannels; there was a reduction last year and again this year, the two together making a total reduction of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In wool fabrics, the total reduction is $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent; in clothing, the total reduction is $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; wool clothing and tweeds $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent; blankets, in one case $9\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, in another case $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, and in another $2\frac{1}{4}$; in cotton fabrics there is a reduction of $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent; in collars and cuffs 7 per cent; in corsets of $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent; in harness $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, besides other items that I might mention. These are all items that enter into the cost of living; they are articles that affect every home; and this means a material reduction in the cost of living. But that is not the only change made so far as the effect upon the customs tariff through the British preference is concerned. I have here another and much larger list, a list of something like 180 articles, many of them important, which have been materially affected by the change in the tariff that we have made through the British preference. Of these 180 articles, in the case of 80 of the items the present rate is over 50 per cent, while in the case of the 100 others the preference runs anywhere from 40 to 50 per cent. One of the planks of the platform was that we should aim to bring about a British preference of 50 per cent. Well, we have brought it about in these 80 items of