

much different from that they pursued when they were in power.

I listened very attentively to the hon. member for Brome, and noticed that he very carefully avoided all reference to the problem that confronts the Government, Parliament, and the people of this country, of how to raise the necessary revenue. The Minister of Finance stated that it would take \$115,000,000 to pay the annual interest on the national debt, and that next year \$40,000,000 would be required for pensions. He also stated in the most convincing manner that the revenue would just meet the interest on the national debt, the amount required for pensions, and the ordinary expenditure of the country, and that any moneys required for capital expenditure would have to be obtained by means of a further loan. I thought that the hon. member for Brome—a genial gentleman whom I admire very much, a good lawyer, and a man very highly thought of in the city from which we both come—after the time and attention he has given to the financial affairs of Canada, would explain to the House how he would raise the necessary revenue; but, alas, I heard nothing from him in that regard whatever. He made no reference in his remarks to his former speech in this House on the 25th of March last—when I was not in my place in this House owing to a serious illness—and no reference whatever to the amendment he proposed at that time and I could not help wondering whether the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) had told him to put the soft pedal on his Free Trade principles. I recall with a great deal of satisfaction that the leader of the Opposition stated in this House not many nights ago, that as regards the policy of protection for Canada he was not going to make up his mind on any theories, but on facts, and facts alone. I am in entire accord with him there. In his amendment on the 25th of March, the hon. member for Brome proposed a reduction in the tariff on a great number of articles which I shall not take up the time of the House to enumerate, as hon. gentlemen are perfectly familiar with his amendment and the speech he made on that occasion.

I consulted Hansard this afternoon when the hon. member was speaking to see if I could find there any argument advanced by him whereby the country would raise the necessary revenue if it pursued such a policy as he outlined. If there was to be a reduction in the duties on a large number of manufactured articles, thereby very materially reducing the revenue, and then a further gradual reduction of the tariff

as he proposed, I was anxious to ascertain what counter-proposal he had to meet the situation. I could find nothing on the pages of Hansard to show how the hon. member could raise the necessary revenue, but he did say that if the Government took off the 7½ per cent war tax, he believed that, as a consequence, the manufacturers would make more money and that the revenue could be increased through the income tax. I am afraid, however, that the hon. gentleman would be disappointed in this respect, for he would not obtain very much revenue in that way. He made another suggestion, that if the tariff were reduced the imports coming into the country would be larger and we would get the necessary revenue as a result. Well, I am a tyro in public life and a new member of this House, and while I have not had very much experience in public affairs, I think I may safely say that one can take as his very best guide in matters of this kind the policy of such great men as have filled the office of Prime Minister of this country during the last fifty years. And when the policy of moderate protection has been adhered to by both Conservative and Liberal Governments, that must be the easiest and best way of raising the necessary revenue, and also the fairest and most equitable system having regard to the diversified interests that exist. We frequently hear it said that the tariff is for what some people are pleased to term the privileged or big interests, or the special class. I have been in the manufacturing business all my life and I have no hesitation in saying that if the tariff were framed in the interests of manufacturers alone it would prove a very poor tariff from their point of view. The tariff is not so framed. It is not framed for the manufacturers nor for the farming community alone; nor is it framed with any other special class in view. It is framed and put into effect in the interests of all classes. If the manufacturers could obtain a tariff at their will I say they would not want a high tariff. I think I am speaking fairly for the majority of manufacturers of this country when I say that all that they want is just a moderate protective tariff. The manufacturers are not looking for restricted trade but for the largest volume of business that it is possible for them to gain, not only in the home market, but also in foreign markets, and the business men well know that the greater the volume of business the lower the cost of production, and that eventually the manufacturer makes more money by a large than by a small