

Then the article goes on to say—and this is taken from the evidence of consuls and others—that these aliens smuggled across the New York-Vermont boundary line alone amounted to no less than 25,000 in the last six months of last year. Consider what would be the number over the whole boundary in a year and add to these the Canadians estimated by the same investigator as between 75,000 and 150,000 who go and do not pay the head tax—put these three classes together and hon. gentlemen have some conception of the consequences of policy which this government pursues.

I want to make some reference to the position of labour in this matter, and to make reply to interrogations put to me in his speech on the budget by the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine). I believe the mass of labour understands, and just as clearly as any other portion of Canada, that a protective policy is essential in the interests of labour. I do not plead for a protective policy in the interest of farmer, labourer, employer, or anybody else. In the name of no class in Canada in particular do I plead for this policy; I plead for it in the name of Canada. But if there is one class of our population to whom it is more vital than to any other it is certainly the labour class. The manufacturer can close his doors and can open over there. He loses, perhaps, but he has something left; in a great many cases at least he has something left. When he goes not one but scores, hundreds, maybe thousands, of labouring men are left who although in no position to sacrifice their earnings, earnings that they have invested in homes, have to abandon those homes and betake themselves to another land. They are the ones who have the most at stake, the most to lose, by alienation from Canada. Mr. Tom Moore, who has been honoured by this government and therefore is one I may be allowed to quote, has written a series of very able articles in labour journals and in other periodicals as well, strongly urging upon the labour population of this country that their only hope is in the adoption of a firm and definite protective policy. Mr. Moore says:

Labour accepts the principle of protection as a necessary corollary to the protection of their own means of making a living.

No man ever condensed the whole doctrine and purpose of protection, as applied to labour, in more vivid and faithful words. He is followed by a labour leader of the province of Quebec writing in *Industrial Canada*, preaching the same doctrine with the same emphasis; and certainly the bit-

terness, which labour has endured, the suffering these late years, has brought the workers of Canada to much the viewpoint of workers in Australia and in other lands whose level of living has been heightened by the adoption of sane fiscal principles.

The hon. member for East Calgary first of all asks "Is it the intention of the Conservative party to put in effect a definite, and really, protective policy? Are you going really to protect?" Well, if I ever gave an emphatic answer in my life I do so now when I give that question an unqualified affirmative. The Conservative party through its history has been committed to the principle; the Conservative party sees the need for the implementing of that principle in action and policy more clearly and more emphatically to-day than ever before in the history of Canada. The Conservative party has not witnessed in vain the dire consequences of the last three years of vacillation and of drift, and we are going to rescue Canada from the consequences of that shiftless and aimless course.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Will the right hon. member tell me, is there any guarantee whatever that the protection of an industry means the protection of the interests of the employees of that industry?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. The Prime Minister says "hear, hear", and by that "hear, hear" he intimates a belief that the protection of industry means nothing to the employee. I wonder, did the protection of the glass industry at Hamilton mean nothing to the employees there? Employees in Hamilton had to sacrifice their homes, abandon them and go away. Did protection mean nothing to the various fertilizer-workers mentioned by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Harris), those men who followed the machinery from place to place in a vain hope that their means of living would be restored? Does the Prime Minister say it meant nothing to the employees of the shoe industry of Quebec and Montreal and other towns, men who have gone already in hundreds? Or did it mean nothing to the employees of the woollen industry who had to go away in thousands?

Mr. ROBB: Will the right hon. member tell us to what extent the tariff on glass has been changed since he was in office in 1921?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I told the hon. member all about that when I spoke in this House a year ago. The tariff on glass was changed

because the Belgian franc fell low. The depreciation of the Belgian franc removed a large portion of the protection.

Mr. ROBB: It was the same Belgian franc that bought the Canadian goods.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very good. But what has that to do with the case? The depreciation of the Belgian franc virtually removed the protection. We in our time had a clause in our tariff which protected against such depreciation. Hon. gentlemen opposite with a flourish of trumpets removed it; that is what brought down the protection on glass, and that is what destroyed an industry where \$2,000,000 were invested, wiped out an industry where 600 hands were directly and indirectly employed, furthermore that is what lost to the railways of Canada 60,000 tons of freight. The hon. gentleman cannot name me one single individual in this Dominion who profited to the extent of one dollar. Because when Canadian competition became extinct the price went up. I see the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) in his seat. I wonder if he would suggest—no he would never so suggest, I have too high an opinion of his intelligence to believe he would—that a protective tariff means nothing to labour. Does it mean nothing to the labourer of Brantford? I quote from the statement of an alderman of that city who accompanied many representatives of other cities to Toronto to try to get some help from the government there to assist the unemployed. Speaking on behalf of the city of Brantford, in the month of February, Alderman W. H. Freehorn said, as reported in the *Toronto Star*:

Conditions were very bad in his town; scores of people were leaving every week.

These were not wealthy people, but these were poor people out of work. I appeal to my hon. friend from Brantford and ask if I am not right.

As many as 300 houses could be bought at less than cost. The population had been reduced from 33,000 to 28,000. From 1,000 to 1,200 people were jobless. Hundreds of families were seeking relief. We do not know what to do about it. If we increase our tax rate we drive more people out. We're handing out doles right now. We need direct assistance as was given in 1921. We have no money to spend on public works.

I want to know if the Prime Minister will suggest that a protective tariff meant nothing to those labourers in Brantford who had to abandon, not only their homes but their country. To the extent of 5,000 according to Mr. Freehorn they have left the city. I was about to answer the question put by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine). He said:

"What are you going to do to see that too high prices are not charged in this country?" That is a very pertinent question. I know it is always in the mind of him who fears protection, and it is based on the assumption that a protective tariff necessarily increases the level of prices. No one would argue that there would not be individual cases of increased prices; but even if the cases were universal, it is far better to have a small increase of price with a job which provides the money to pay that price than to have a despairing home where nobody can find work and nobody able to pay any price at all. But the fact has been proven by experience that the general level is not increased. The assumption that it is is based on the belief that there is no effective competition within the borders of the country itself. If that assumption is correct I suppose the tendency of human nature could be relied on to get the utmost price. But that assumption cannot be correct unless the whole industry is under monopoly. Well, if we are to assume that the whole production in any industry, is under monopoly in our country, it is surely equally likely that it would be under a monopoly in the other country. If we have to live under a monopoly, I would rather it should be under a monopoly over which our parliament has jurisdiction and which it can control, than a monopoly over which we have no jurisdiction and cannot in the least control. The fact is—and surely I will be endorsed by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) in this assertion—that the industries which lend themselves to monopoly are relatively very, very few, even if the government stand aside and never interfere, and no government is going to do that. I wonder, sir, if there is any possibility, for example, of monopoly in the shoe industry of Canada. I wonder if there is any possibility of a monopoly in the woollen industry in Canada. Did anybody ever suggest that a monopoly existed there? With 1,300 firms engaged in the shoe industry, does anybody suggest that in the case of these concerns, all making their own styles and fighting for their trade, a monopoly is conceivable? But if competition should fail to keep down price, and if monopoly should raise the price, it is at least a monopoly which the government has power to regulate in the interests of the consuming public. It is far better to be under those conditions, even if they must come—and I do not for a moment concede that any industry in Canada can