

experience of Canada, and we have learned from our experience.

I will not labour the point further. I have no hope on earth of ever convincing some hon. gentlemen to my left who say our course now is to drop our tariff inch by inch and foot by foot, because they believe the United States is going to have a lower tariff soon, and they think, forsooth, that this course on our part would likely accelerate that condition of affairs. I have listened to so many prophecies about what the United States are going to do in the way of low tariff that I have almost lost my faith. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) will recall that, year after year, he thought they were getting pretty close to a low tariff in the United States. If he does not recall it, he will remember the eloquence of his friend from Red Deer of that date, who professed, in season and out, right up to the emergency tariff of 1921, a belief that the United States were getting pretty near to free trade. He used to employ the language used in this debate by the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw). "Why," he would say, "over there they are paying just a few cents per capita in customs taxes and here we are paying a great deal more per capita; so we are far more protectionist than they." This really was the language echoed by the hon. member for West Calgary. As if the amount they are paying per capita was not governed by the height of their tariff. Why, on the reasoning of the hon. member for West Calgary, Great Britain is to-day the most highly protected country in the world. They have a far higher per capita customs duty than we have, far higher, I think ten times as high as that of the United States. No, the hon. member who was leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) shed his prophecies when the emergency tariff came down, but he seems to have passed the mantle of Elijah to his successor from Brandon (Mr. Forke), for that hon. gentleman rose even in this debate and foretold that they would very soon have a low tariff in the United States. I would advise him to wait. He will possibly see a reduction—but he will likely live to see that reduction done away with. If he lives long enough, he will come to the conclusion that we had better make our tariff to suit ourselves.

Mr. FORKE: I think I stated specifically, when I spoke on the budget, that we ought to frame our tariff independently of anything the United States might do. Our fiscal policy should be one to suit ourselves.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very glad that, to this extent, I have made a convert of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke). I ask him carefully to remember his words, to remember, when the question of reciprocity comes up again, the virtuous conviction of this hour. He is right to-day, and I hope he will give us a better example of the perseverance of the saints than this government has ever done. Yes, we should make and maintain our tariff according to a principle which is suited to Canada.

Mr. FORKE: I agree with that. I do not see what I have to take back.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wonder if hon. gentlemen to my left believe that in attacks upon this principle—for many of them make them sincerely—they are really making any gains. They heard the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) say: "This budget is the death knell of protection; protection is not all gone, but it is going little by little; its death knell has rung." They heard that all right, and they heard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) proclaim that the blessed day of the execution of the 1919 platform was about to dawn. They have listened to those things, but I wonder if they have listened to other things as well. Have they heard from hon. gentlemen over there any falling away from the protective principle? Those men who are going to vote for the budget, scores of them—does anyone think they believe in the principle of the hon. member from Marquette? Does anyone think they believe in it even as applied in this budget? Not one out of ten of them does, and all I need appeal to is their words in this House. For example, the hon. member for Quebec county (Mr. Lavigneur) is ready to vote for the budget. Yes, but he says: In our country we are making boots and shoes; you keep your profane hands off boots and shoes; I will support you as long as you stick to something we do not make; I am ready to vote for low farm implements, because, as he answered me, that is protection for the farmers; but boots and shoes, never! He complained that the duty to-day was far too low on boots and shoes—he who is supposed to stand up in this House and vote for a duty one-third the size in respect of a very vital industry in this Dominion. Let no one mistake my words: I support the hon. gentleman from Quebec in respect of boots and shoes; but I apply his principle all round. I wonder whether hon. gentlemen to my left think that those across the way really believe in one single