

burg (Mr. Duff) had a pocketful of snapshots that he used to slide around this chamber to enlighten us as to the impossibilities of that route, showing huge ice floes, and fields of ice, and vessels marooned in the ice. I wonder if he has destroyed them—or may we look for them again?

Then, in addition to those two items, we have a tariff clause. Well, there is nothing very definite in that paragraph. It says that a general increase in the customs tariff would prove detrimental to the country's continued prosperity. That does not tell us that there will not be some minor increases or some particular increases; it just says that a general increase would prove detrimental. This is one question upon which I am not just sure what kind of opinion to form. I recall that in the last parliament the then member for Brantford, I believe it was Mr. Raymond, a very estimable gentleman—I am not sure that he did not go to the slaughter—asked this question of the right hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Meighen) when he was speaking on his tariff resolution: "If you should become Prime Minister, would you restore on agricultural implements the duty that was taken off during the previous session?" If I remember correctly, the right hon. leader of the opposition said: "Most certainly I would."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I am not sure what to infer from that applause, but I know that the people of western Canada do not want any further tariff on agricultural implements. It is true that the reductions were very trifling; it is true that the prices of agricultural implements were not very considerably lowered, but it was a slight step in the right direction. It was supported by this group in the hope that at the next session a longer stride would be taken in the same direction, but we hoped in vain; no such action followed. I rather fear the occupying of the treasury benches by a group headed by a leader who has definitely pronounced himself in that respect, except from this point of view: he and his group cannot raise the tariff without the consent of this group. With regard to the tariff question, therefore, we are faced with these two viewpoints: the occupying of the treasury benches by one group who are pledged to raise the tariff but who could not raise it unless we said so, or the occupying of the treasury benches by another group who are pledged to lower the tariff, but who will not lower it. So that so far as the question of the tariff is concerned, it seems to me that we can lay it aside.

There is one other clause in the Speech from the Throne in which the government

congratulate themselves, or rather "congratulate you," on the growing prosperity of this favoured land. Then they further state: "This increased prosperity and advancement have been aided by the policies of the government." It would be far more appropriate to give Divine Providence the credit.

There is one other matter that is not embodied in the Speech from the Throne, and it is a matter of vital importance to the section of the country from which I come. It is a matter upon which I have heard the leader of the opposition (Mr. Meighen) express himself in no uncertain terms in this House—indeed I believe he did in the country also—and that is the matter of the statutory rates as existing under the Crowsnest agreement, that old bill of rights that was given us in western Canada away back in the year 1897, and to which the average westerner looks for protection. That agreement has all been thrown in the scrap heap with the exception of the rates as respecting grain and flour. I do fear, according to the statement as expressed, that an effort might be made to wipe out the rest of those rates, and I do fear the result of such action. I am satisfied that western Canada would not stand for the wiping out of the rates on grain and flour.

One of the reasons why I would like to have seen the debate carried on by members from each of the larger groups is that such questions as these might be enlarged upon and definite pronouncements made upon them. I am not going to say that the right hon. leader of the opposition should reverse his decision, because I do not think he would do so; I have that opinion of him, that his opinions as expressed are usually lived up to, but if his expressed opinion in regard to this one subject is to be carried out, I fear there is not much western support back of it.

The Progressive group in this House has come into being in a rather unique way. We are not a party in the sense of the Liberal group or the Conservative group, though we may be called a party, and some may look upon us as a party. We are really a group of individuals representing public opinion. The origin of the Progressive group, so far as western Canada goes, dates back to the year 1901. The action as taken among western Canadian farmers at that time was for economic advantage, but they found later on that it was necessary to take political action in order to reap the economic advantages at which they were aiming; and so we found in the year 1919 that a few members of this House started what was known as the Progressive group. I do not know where the