

the animal products, and also the textile industries. There are, further, the industries that relate to forestry, such as wood and paper, and those relating to the mines, such as iron and its products, non-ferrous metals and their products, chemical products, and so on; then certain miscellaneous industries; and, finally, the construction industries, hand trades, repairs, and so on. If one looks critically at this list of industries one will find that a great many depend almost entirely on the products of agriculture; others mainly on mineral products, some on the forest, and others again on the combination of the basic industries I have mentioned. In other words, the whole industrial structure, the whole industrial life of the country, is built up on the development of these basic industries. And that is the reason why in the tariff which we have brought down we have confined the changes to the reduction of duties on implements of production in the basic industries. We have tried to make possible a larger production in agriculture, in mining, in lumbering and in the fisheries, knowing that, as we help to stimulate these industries, every manufacturer and every employer in the country will be assisted. But not only will the manufacturing industries benefit; all transportation enterprises, the whole of the commercial and industrial life of the country, and as well the export trade and finance, will stand to gain, and with the industries and trades the great body of consumers who compose the nation. If one will pause to reflect one will see that that is the only sound national policy, the only basis on which national development can take place.

I might conclude this phase of my observations by presenting to the House an analogy which will serve to illustrate my conception of the relation of the manufacturing industries of the country to the great basic industries. I think of Canadian agriculture as the trunk of a great tree, and of its current production as the sap—the life-blood of the tree. The current products—the animal and the vegetable products—leave the trunk of the tree and supply life and aliment to the great branches—to such great manufactures as flour-milling, slaughtering and meat packing, butter and cheese, bread and bakery products, biscuits and confectionery, and so forth, as well as to such smaller branches as prepared breakfast foods, stock and poultry foods, condensed milk, tanneries, leather goods, and so forth—all of which industries were in days of less specialized production carried on upon the farm itself. My idea is that if we desire to promote the prosperity of even these smaller branches of our tree, the best way is to culti-

vate the ground around its trunk, from which it draws its sustenance, thus increasing the flow of products which pass from the trunk into the manufacturing processes of the branches. That, I submit, is the natural and obvious way of promoting industrial prosperity, and that is why this government is reducing the duties on agricultural implements—those duties which restrict production. But if I may go on with the analogy, the opposition's method of handling the situation is first to tap the trunk at its base by the duties upon agricultural implements, and thereafter to favour one branch of industry at the expense of another—in other words, to control and divert existing supplies of products rather than take the obvious way of increasing all products by working the soil around the tree and affording it all possible nutriment.

Similarly, again, with our forestry industry. In our statistical classification, there appear under the general heading "wood and paper" no fewer than forty-three distinct manufacturing industries deriving their raw material from our forests, which also supply a large part of the raw material for our construction industries. It seems to me that there can be no better way of promoting the welfare of these industries—the branches of our great "forest tree"—than by diminishing the duties which have a tendency to restrict our forestry production.

Again, the same analogy applies to the many industries based upon our mines and quarries.

This, Sir, is our reason for reducing duties on agricultural, forestry and mining machinery, and I feel that it is a reason which will commend itself to the good judgment of this House. It is true that certain industries may, for the time being, experience inconvenience from the partial withdrawal of artificial stimuli supplied to them in the past; while we regret this, our action must be determined by regard for the best interests of the country as a whole. The government has done its utmost to soften the shock to the industries immediately concerned, and to avoid the possibility of their sustaining any appreciable injury or loss.

There, Mr. Speaker, is the difference between ourselves and the opposition, there is where we join issue with our opponents. They stand for the protection of a few special interests; we seek to develop the industrial life of the Dominion as a whole and with it to improve its commercial and financial prosperity.

At six o'clock the House took recess.