

dence in this Administration. Political life at any time is not distinguished for the gratitude shown to its participants, and so far as I am concerned, I have no desire to be one of those to say to the members of this Government: Here are your hats, and there is the door. I feel they have done their best, honestly and fairly to give good Government to this country, and I was pleased the other day to hear the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) make the statement, and I believe sincerely, and it was repeated this afternoon by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) with equal sincerity, I believe, that this Government has given to Canada the best government it ever had. Another thing that struck me when the Acting Prime Minister made that statement was this: So far as I remember, in the political life of this country there has hardly ever been a government of either political colour of which some member, whether rightly or wrongly, has not been accused of grafting or dishonesty, but I have yet to hear of any shadow of accusation of graft or dishonesty levelled against any member of this Government. I have, therefore, no apologies to make for voting against this amendment, and no apologies to make that I have so far given an honest and fair support to this Government. At the same time, while I am not at all convinced that there is the urgent necessity for an election which is implied in the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. I think that after this session of Parliament it is the duty of this Government to give very serious consideration to the claims that the Union Government has fulfilled the purposes for which it was elected, and that it is time for the people to be given a chance at the polls to elect a group of men, perhaps this same group, or a different one, to handle the affairs of this country. I am not absolutely convinced that the election that is spoken of in the amendment should be indefinitely postponed, because, after all, in a democracy the people must have some say in running the country. Therefore, I repeat, the Government should give serious consideration to that question, and if they feel that the demand for an election is as widespread as it is claimed to be by some, it should be their duty to think of going to the country and giving the people an opportunity to express themselves at the polls.

Regarding the Franchise Act, I think two sentences will suffice, and I think they will cover pretty well what most members on both sides of the House feel regarding a

franchise Bill. First, it should be fair and honest, and should be based on sound Canadianism; and the machinery for operating the Act should be as fool-proof and as crook-proof as possible. Furthermore, I think the Government should keep faith with any men and any people to whom they have given a promise, so long as those people have neither been disloyal nor done anything detrimental to good Canadian citizenship.

Now I am going to tread on dangerous ground, particularly for a young member like myself; I refer to the tariff. We have listened in this House for some days now to views upon the tariff, some of which were extreme on opposite sides. We have heard the extreme free traders of the West, or one or two of them, and a few extreme protectionists from the East. I am of the opinion that the sane moderate minded people of this country, and I think that means the majority, will not allow this question to be settled either by extreme protectionists of the East or by extreme free traders of the West. I believe that they will ultimately demand that a thorough investigation be made of this question and that the findings of that investigation be utilized as far as possible in framing a scientific tariff of moderate proportions. In that connection there are three principles which appeal to me. First, any industry of which there is no hope that it will ultimately get to the stage where it does not need to be pap-fed, the stage where it can compete with industries of like nature in other parts of the world, should not be given protection. No further attempt should be made to build it up. The fact that there are a number of industries in this country which have been highly protected for forty or fifty years, and which still claim to be infant industries, is one of the reasons why a great many of the moderate-minded people of this country feel a little disgust with high protection. The second principle which appeals to me is that if fifteen per cent of protection is enough to assist a certain industry to compete with the same industry in the United States, there is no reason for giving an industry such as this thirty-five or forty per cent protection. If you give too high a protection to an industry such as this, you simply eliminate completely any competition from other countries, you enable the owners of the industry to overcharge the people of this country, and you may give rise to dangerous combinations in restraint of trade. In other words: A very high tariff