

times as much dependent upon foreign trade as is the United States. I am delighted to see the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) nodding his head, because I consider him an authority in all respects in these matters. As I was saying, those figures show that we are very much more dependent on foreign trade than is the United States, from which our friends to your immediate left, Mr. Speaker, are so insistent in endeavouring to draw lessons. My hon. friend asked me if I was prepared for the elimination of the tariff.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Are you in favour of any measure of protection?

Mr. PUTNAM: I hope for some far off Divine event of which Tennyson speaks. I hope the whole creation, including my hon. friend and his friends, are moving to that goal. I do hope for a time when protection will be exterminated root and branch; destroyed, horse, foot and artillery. I agree with my hon. friend that it will not come suddenly. The tariff was built up under a vicious and mischievous system, and I believe that just as fast as we can stand it, and without undue dislocation of industry, and with due protection even of the mushroom industries, some of which should never have been started—

Mr. RYCKMAN: Artificial silk for instance, established last year.

Mr. PUTNAM: Artificial silk and artificial arguments.

Mr. RYCKMAN: That is not an answer.

Mr. PUTNAM: My hon. friend is very discriminating to-night. You cannot build up a system by quoting artificial silk or any other isolated item, and we have not time to make a new tariff even for my good friend from Toronto. But I want to answer him frankly. My position is, that just as fast as we can get the tariff down to a revenue tariff basis, and I do not pretend to judge how fast that should come about, we should do it. I believe that is the solution of the tariff problem for Canada. I believe that in time we shall gradually weed out all the tares from the wheat and get down to a purely revenue tariff, with the revenue raised wholly and solely for the public service. I think in that process, if my hon. friend is really referring to my wisdom, there will be a very long term of protection, geographical and incidental, yet, but I confidently look forward to the undoing of the mischief that was done by Sir John Macdonald in 1878. But it should be done slowly, and I hope it can be done

[Mr. Putnam.]

without undue hardship to any legitimate business.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend has used a phrase which is quite frequently used, and that is that the tariff should be reduced to a revenue basis. Would he be good enough to say at what point he expects the element of protection to be eliminated and the tariff to be simply a revenue tariff? The reason I ask him the question is that a moment ago he asked for a definition of an adequate tariff.

Mr. PUTNAM: I do not know that I entirely apprehend the full meaning of the question.

Mr. STEVENS: I am sorry I did not make myself clear. The question was, at what point in the reduction of the tariff does my hon. friend expect to arrive at what he terms a revenue tariff, where there will be no protective element, but merely a revenue tariff element. My hon. friend has had two ministers helping him.

Mr. GRAHAM: You should not object.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I can answer it.

Mr. PUTNAM: In the main it is a tariff that will get the revenue into the treasury, and not into the pocket of the protected manufacturers. I am a little bit surprised at that particular brand of courtesy which prompted my hon. friend to say that I was receiving help in answering the question. It so happened that I did not receive any help, and I am surprised at that little departure from the splendid courtesy which I have always associated with the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), when he twitted me that I was waiting for help before I answered. I think it was just a little unworthy of him.

Mr. JACOBS: He was encumbered by help.

Mr. STEVENS: I think my hon. friend is correct.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The hon. Minister of Justice said that he would come to his assistance, and I would therefore ask him where the protective tariff on boots and shoes would cease, and the tariff remain only a revenue tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I am absolutely in order. I ask the hon. gentleman where the protective tariff on boots and shoes would cease and where the revenue tariff would come in? Give it to us in percentages and, with the permission of the hon. member for