

to wipe out special privilege in this direction, why did they not start on the tariff schedule in respect to cotton goods when arranging their budget? On the contrary, these cotton duties are maintained. And the same condition applies not only to the textile industry, but to many other industries as well.

If his objections were well founded at that time they are equally well founded to-day, because the same duties on textiles are maintained. At a later time when cross questioned by the then Minister of the Interior, Mr. Meighen, he said:

I want to know what are the views of my hon. friend opposite on this question. I would like the Minister of the Interior, in his next speech, or the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, to state his views as to what duties should prevail on, say, agricultural implements, on textiles, and on iron and coal.

At that time the hon. minister was deriding the duties upon iron, coal, cottons and woollens; yet to-day he joins the government in bringing in a tariff which is doubling the duty on iron and coal. At a later time the hon. gentleman makes this statement:

I make the statement in all seriousness that the protective tariff has been the greatest agency for exploiting our people that was ever devised.

I wonder if he holds to-night the same opinion about the protective tariff; if he does I wonder what right he has to sit in this government. Then, again, on March 14, 1922, at page 55 of Hansard he expressed himself thus:

There are some changes forecast in the customs tariff . . . I hope it forecasts a revision of duties downwards. I cannot conceive for a moment that the government would think of revising the tariff upwards. I hope that will not be done.

These are only a few of the many statements of the hon. gentlemen opposite wherein they expressed themselves in opposition to the principle of the tariff and budget which they have brought down this session and have asked parliament to adopt. Then in Hansard of March 4, 1920, we find the following at page 148:

What is the purpose of a tariff? It is designed to benefit a particular section of the people, it operates in no other way, and consequently the operation of this protective system in our fiscal policy, which has obtained largely for the last forty years, has conferred upon a special class a privilege that in my judgment is not compatible with a true democracy. And I would point out to my hon. friend from Brantford and to other hon. gentlemen also who believe in a protective tariff, that protection is nothing more or less than a type of state socialism.

These are the opinions of the present Minister of Railways. I could multiply the quota-

tions if time permitted, but I must hurry on.

For a minute or two I wish to deal with statements made by the Acting Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) who has held himself out to be the friend of the farmers in this country. I find that the hon. gentleman was sworn in on October 12, 1917, as Minister of Agriculture, and his very first act as a minister of the crown was to pass an order in council permitting the manufacture of oleomargarine. Some hon. gentlemen opposite were anxious the other night to find out something about this, and I wonder why they did not direct their attention to the present Minister of Railways. He was the man who put that into force in this country. Not only that but his next act on behalf of the farmers was to buy all the screenings from the elevators at the head of the lakes. These screenings had been sold at an average price of \$8 for some six years previously; the hon. gentleman bought them and sold them to the farmers at \$35 a ton. There was a loss to the government of Canada of something like \$96,000; that is an instance of the manner in which he looked after the interests of the farmers of Canada. Let us go a little further. He also permitted them, by an order in council which cancelled certain regulations, to mix with the foodstuffs of this country certain seeds from the west. The analyses of these seeds, which have been placed upon the records of this house, show a large percentage of poisonous seeds which were detrimental to the health of the live stock of Canada.

What else do we find? In 1918, I believe it was, he confiscated all the butter in this country except that which was held by those who were manufacturing oleomargarine. Of course he could not touch the vested interests, but he could confiscate all the butter belonging to the farmers of Canada, while he protected his pets whom he had allowed to make oleomargarine with which they mixed the butter of the farmers so that it lost its identity.

Then there is another point to which I should like to direct attention. Before six o'clock I mentioned the fact that the hon. gentleman resigned the day before the budget was delivered, and by that budget the duty on agricultural implements was lowered in several instances. At that time the minister's company was in the implement business, and before the commission investigating the high cost of living his secretary, Rice Jones, stated that the company had not lost a dollar because their goods were in bond in Winnipeg. I should like to know where they got that