

We have previously endeavoured to show that it would be advantageous to maintain during peace a surplus revenue of some two, three, or five millions a year. We should do this, not so much in the view of reducing the debt, though that is a consideration not to be left entirely out of view, as of increasing our security, and enabling proper measures to be devised, in the event of our being engaged in war, for defraying its expense.

This philosopher said that the great thing for the British Empire to do before it got rid of the national debt was to lay by some ready cash in order to prepare for the next war. Why did not the Minister of Finance explain the mentality of the man whom he quoted in regard to the treatment of our national debt? This man seemed to think he could look down through generations to come and tell exactly what was going to happen, and advise us how we should handle our national debt. But listen to the views of this philosopher on the development of democracy. I wonder what those who are behind the "flapper votes" in England think of this great philosopher's views on the franchise as it should obtain in England. Let me quote:

In a political point of view the late events in America are pregnant with instruction. The system of low or universal suffrage, of allowing the representatives of the nation to be chosen by a numerical majority, including the lowest classes, could not have been anywhere tried under such favourable circumstances as in the United States, and yet the result has been most deplorable. It has made the mob paramount, thrown the government into the most incompetent hands, and filled the whole country with jobbing and abuses of all sorts. Many of those best acquainted with the people think the crisis will terminate in a military despotism. But whether that be so or not, the experience of the United States is a warning to all nations to beware how they reduce the elective franchise. The Americans are neither better nor worse than others, and the abuses by which they are disgraced would be quite as rampant on this side of the Atlantic were the members of our legislature elected under a similar system.

That indicates the kind of mind that existed fifty years ago. And yet this philosopher is being quoted to-day by the Minister of Finance as a guide in dealing with the national debt!

Now, I consider it important to bring to the attention of the house the strange workings of this strange aggregate known as the "tariff board." They investigated the salt belt, starting somewhere near Kincardine, where the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) comes from, then it perambulates through half a dozen Liberal constituencies and finally winds up near where the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) comes from. Now, a body of men connected with this salt industry came before the tariff board and made the following application:

[Mr. Kaiser.]

Application by the Salt Producers Association for cancellation of the item providing free salt for sea or gulf fishing; for increase of duty on salt imported in bags, barrels or other coverings or in bulk; for the imposition of the same rates of duty on containers filled with salt as applies on empty containers; and for increased duties on free-running table salt.

These business men in a business way put forward a business proposition. They did not complain that they were hard up, they did not say that their business was lagging. They simply said: We have a wonderful salt deposit in our section of the country, but we are hampered in our operations by salt coming in from the United States, from Germany and from the United Kingdom; we claim that if this salt were subject to a duty we would have the full advantage of our home market, we could operate to the full extent of our capacity and we could employ twice as many men. They did not say that they wanted to make more money, but they simply said they were working only 50 per cent of their capacity. Then the mystifying work began. In this house there is something we see on the table, but there is also a game going on under the table that we do not see. When this matter came before this house all we know is that somebody got in contact with the Minister of Finance, with the result that the government said to the salt producers' association: We will grant a rebate of 99 per cent on the coal that you use in the preparation of your salt. That is the most ridiculous line that was ever written into a budget. I will tell you why. It illustrates the difference between the Conservative view and the Liberal view in handling such a matter. We say that the industry should be considered. Here is a means by which 500 families representing 2,500 people could be retained in Canada if the request for the imposition of a duty on salt were granted. But the Liberal mind says: We must fix up the industrialists; we will allow them every January to come down to parliament and by drawbacks take out of the cash box about \$5,000 apiece. There are about ten factories engaged in the salt industry in western Ontario, and in the aggregate they turn out 200,000 tons of salt annually. It requires about 100,000 tons of coal to produce this salt. Fifty cents a ton on the coal means a drawback of about \$50,000 which is divided up among these ten men. But they did not want it. They are sportsmen, and they take more pride in developing their industry than in getting a \$5,000 drawback. That drawback did not add one solitary factory to our industrial development; it did not result in the employment of one additional workman. Two days ago the Canadian Salt Company issued their