

\$1.10 a day. I do not think that was the incentive that took them overseas. But if we are to accept the words of the ex-Minister of Finance the incentive for those of us who remained at home was that we should be permitted to make nice, handsome profits, that we might produce. It seems to be an absurd argument to be used by a member of this House, and it is an insult to the people of Canada who remained at home and in a patriotic way did all they could to help to win the war. The inference can only be that our patriotism was largely of the lips and not of the heart; otherwise, we should have been prepared to carry on without the hope of making large profits. I would like to say a word or two about what the policy of the ex-Minister has done for Canada. One of the things was to build up tremendous fortunes to be loaned to the Government at nice, comfortable rates of interest. We have evidence of that everywhere throughout the country. We do not need to go far afield to find it.

The ex-Minister of Finance went further and possibly the most significant statement that he made was that the protective principle in our tariff must remain. His words were something to this effect: Do not think for a moment that the people of Ontario are going to be satisfied with a tariff for revenue only. The system of protection has to remain. That is a very brief statement, but there is very much implied when you read between the lines. His statement during the first session of 1919 was that we must have a tariff to raise revenue.

Now, Sir, something has intervened and it is said we must have the tariff for protection—in fact the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) made the statement last night that it was a tax for the protection of industry. It seems rather strange, Mr. Speaker, that we should be compelled to pay a tax in order that our industries may flourish.

In conclusion, there is just one more statement the hon. gentleman (Sir Thomas White) made which is of considerable significance at this particular time, viz., that a new Liberal-Conservative party should be formed. What does that name imply? Can you have such a thing as a Liberal-Conservative party? I doubt it very much. If my interpretation of what Liberals claim to be the meaning of Liberalism is correct, it seems to me that such a thing would be absolutely impossible and that the name would only be used for the purposes of deception. I cannot understand how you can have a Liberal-Conservative party, and I

would like to ask the ex-Minister of Finance in what way the Liberal-Conservative party—if you can have such a thing—would differ from the party that we have been pleased to name the new and National Progressive party. The new Liberal-Conservative party can only be composed of former Liberals and Conservatives; it cannot be the old Conservative party and it cannot be the Liberal party, consequently it must be a third party. Yet the ex-Minister of Finance told us yesterday in the early part of his speech that third parties could not survive; although towards the conclusion of his remarks he proposed what in substance—if it could be brought into existence—means nothing more or less than an additional party.

I would repeat that I am delighted that the ex-Minister of Finance saw fit to come here and direct so much attention to those of us who occupy the cross-benches. It suits us very well, and the harder our opponents hit us the better pleased we shall be. Let me close with this statement: The harder you are thrown the higher you will bounce. Don't think of the blackened eye, nor yet of the fact that you got licked, but how did you fight, and why.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Knox,
Baldwin,	Lanctôt,
Béland,	Lapointe,
Boivin,	Lavigneur,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Boyer,	Leger,
Brouillard,	Lesage,
Bureau,	McCoig,
Cahill,	McCrea,
Caldwell,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Cannon,	McKenzie,
Cardin,	McMaster,
Casgrain,	Maharg,
Chisholm,	Marcile (Bagot),
Clark (Red Deer),	Mayrand,
Copp,	Michaud,
Crerar,	Pacaud,
d'Anjou,	Papineau,
Déchène,	Pardee,
Delisle,	Parent,
Demers,	Pedlow,
Desaulniers,	Pelletier,
Deslauriers,	Power,
Devlin,	Proulx,
Duff,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Ethier,	Robb,
Euler,	Ross,
Fafard,	Savard,
Fielding,	Séguin,
Fournier,	Sinclair (Antigonish
Gauthier,	& Guysborough),