

Let us try and realize that we are people of a common country with a great future before it. Let the people of the East try to understand the people of the West, and let those in the West try to get the viewpoint of eastern people. By doing that we shall be pursuing a course that is likely to yield a solution of our difficulties. One way to understand the western situation is to visit the West and talk to the people there. I paid a visit myself to the West and that formed the subject of some misrepresentation on the part of the leader of the opposition which, I may say, is his strong suit. It was represented that I journeyed to the West in a private car. I did not, I went in the ordinary way and had a good time. I met the people of the West and by personal observation realized what they were struggling against. The western people should also endeavour to familiarize themselves with the conditions in the East. If both sections of the country better understood each other's problems they would be better able to co-operate in developing this country in the future than they have been in the past.

In conclusion, I sincerely trust that the people of the Maritime provinces will abandon the policy of abusing each other, or abusing Sir Henry Thornton. I trust they will come to the conclusion, so far as the latter gentleman is concerned, that he is engaged in doing what he can, not only in the interests of the National Railways but for the benefit of the country as a whole. I believe that Sir Henry Thornton is just as friendly and sympathetic towards the Maritime provinces as he is towards any other part of the Dominion. Finally let me say that if we discuss our problems in the spirit which I have indicated there can be no doubt but that we shall arrive at conclusions which will be not only beneficial to the Maritime provinces but will be fraught with the greatest good to Canada as a whole.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): If the arguments of the Secretary of State were as powerful as his voice, and were as vigorous as his manner in presenting them, we might expect to find nothing but whispers from any other portion of the chamber in any attempt at reply. I am especially impressed with the—shall I say—philosophical reference of the hon. gentleman to a consideration of national problems retrospectively, leading us to believe that he did not care very much what people thought in days gone by or how they solved their problems. The hon. gentleman closed with the statement that we must deal in the living present and not in the past. I commend to the hon. gentleman greater consideration for the experience of those who have gone

[Mr. Copp.]

before him. If he studies that experience he will perhaps find it easier to arrive at the solution of the problems of to-day. That observation has never been more applicable than it is to the question of the tariff which, after all, is the chief issue before the parliament and people of Canada to-day. For that reason I propose to occupy a few minutes to impress upon the House what I consider to be the wishes of 90 per cent of my constituents in a riding having a population of about 55,000 people.

The tariff has long been a subject of political dissertation. The other day I was reading an account of the origin of the word "tariff." It seems that the Moors about the 13th century had control of a little town named Tarifa about twenty-one miles from Gibraltar. Tarifa being in a very strategical position the Moors were able to collect tribute from ships that passed through the straits. Although other nations of Europe have not behind them the British Empire advantage of the bulwark of the great fortress of Gibraltar, yet they have copied from the Moors the idea of protecting their commerce and industry by a tariff, and to-day you find in every great commercial country a protective tariff very much higher than the one we have in Canada. Even the key industries of Britain, a country supposed to have free trade, are under a large revenue collecting tariff. The revenue collected by Great Britain from customs duties is five times more per capita than the amount collected by the United States. According to the Statesman's Year Book, the leading authority on statistics of Britain, the United Kingdom collected customs duties in 1920 to the amount of about \$700,000,000, while the United States collected in the same year, \$322,000,000, or in the case of the former, five times that of the United States on a per capita basis.

Before considering the question of a protective tariff, I would like to give the House what I believe to be a very good definition of it, one which was given by the late President William McKinley in his speech in congress, when he was an ordinary member, in 1888. He said:

Our kind of tariff makes the competing foreign article carry the burden, draw the load, supply the revenue and in performing this essential office it encourages at the same time our own industries and protects our own people in their chosen employment. That is the mission and purpose of a protective tariff.

The outstanding message of the budget with its new fiscal policy which the government presented to the people of Canada is, to use the words of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil), "The death knell of the protective system." It also means