

the experience in so many instances that the business men of Canada have learned.

I want to know what hon. member with a dollar to invest, thinking of establishing an enterprise, if he knew that in the United States he would have 110,000,000 people to cater to, and that here he would have only 8,000,000 or 8,500,000 and only such portion of those as his competitors over there had not taken for themselves, would establish himself here instead of there. I should like hon. members to think these things out. It is a hard cold fact that business men, as farmers and everybody else, usually go—subject to certain patriotic restraints—where they can do the best. And, with a plain case before them of every advantage there which could be got here—save, of course, certain local conditions and circumstances which, in the aggregate and speaking generally do not amount to a great deal—and with only a fraction of the advantage here that they would have there, which of them would choose to establish on this side of the international line rather than on that? But the manufacturer who starts in Canada depends, of course, upon having an advantage in his home market corresponding to that which his American competitor has in his own country. This is the 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—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 argument they have advanced. Hon. gentlemen have been advancing the argument all along that when you impose a duty you make the farmer or the consumer pay the whole amount of it not only on imported goods but over the whole line of similar Canadian-made goods which they buy. Well, if such is the case in boots and shoes I am sorry for the consumer. Of boots and shoes we are importing about 5 per cent of our supply, so that for every dollar of the duty paid in taxes, according to hon. gentlemen to my left, there is paid the sum of \$19 to the manufacturer in Canada. And this, mark you, is a "revenue" tariff government. Let hon. gentlemen listen to the Prime Minister when he speaks and they will find him extolling the virtues of a "revenue" tariff. Yet this government of "revenue" tariff is taking, in the boot and shoe industry, about \$300,000 a year in duties, getting it only from 5 per cent of an importation. The government know right well that if they cut the duty in two on boots and shoes they would get far more revenue for the country. Will the Prime Minister dispute that? Do not let him or any other hon. member say that I am suggesting the cutting of the duty on boots and shoes. I would not have made the reduction of last year, for I believe in fair protection for boots and shoes the same as for everything else. But imagine a government pretending to advocate a "revenue" tariff, and collecting a duty which it does

on the importation of a commodity in respect of which, according to their friends and allies, there is involved an imposition on the consumer of \$19 for every one dollar collected in taxes. No; the hon. member for Quebec county (Mr. Lavigneur) says: "Keep your sacrilegious hands off boots and shoes." But he is just the same as the others. What about the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe)? I warned hon. gentlemen to my left two months ago that if they wanted to test the government's real opinion of the principle which they—the government—are always denouncing, all that they had to do was to turn their barrage against boots and shoes. Why, when a delegation came down two weeks or so ago the Minister of Justice appeared before them and, as reported to me, tried to have them think that we were attacking the duty on boots and shoes on this side. The minister nods; he says no. Well, I am glad to have him confess openly in this House that we have not attacked it. But I do know that he painted himself as Horatius on the bridge standing gallantly against the Tarquin hosts.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Preston) yesterday said that the Minister of Justice was looking after his own constituents and was not touching boots and shoes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So he is; but why not look after others too? The Minister, says, "Don't put your hands into my county". And what about the Minister of Customs, the hon. member for Three Rivers, (Mr. Bureau)? He is ready to vote dismay to the city of Hamilton; he is quite prepared to sacrifice the city of Toronto, the city of Brantford, and indeed to sacrifice all his divorced wife's relations so long as Three Rivers is left untouched. But if any one attempts seriously to invade the industries there, he will know something of what it means to prod the tiger in his lair. Again, what about the Minister of Railways himself? He stands in the citadel of Brockville—there at least is his home—and, while he has not done much to the constituency of South Essex, he is ready nevertheless to strike a blow at Hamilton, at Toronto, at Brantford, at Smith's Falls, in short, at all those counties which suffer particularly from the virtual abolition of duties on their manufactured products, but glancing jealously at the Canada Forgings plant in Brockville he holds up his warning hand and says: "Keep your fingers out of my lawn mowers". He extracts lawn mowers—

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend, if he will read the tariff carefully, will gather a