

each pair of shoes does not strike me as being a matter that can be easily dismissed. And when you have to reckon on four pairs of shoes per person per year it becomes quite a serious problem in the domestic budget. And, then, in the matter of under-clothing and other articles of apparel, when you have to pay an aggregate of \$300 as a result of protection, I do not think that a difference of 30 cents on a pair of shoes is one that can be pooh-poohed. It is a consideration for every family-loving man in Canada.

It has been stated that we must have protection to safeguard our infant industries. Now, I can readily understand that protection was justifiable in the time of Sir John A. Macdonald, in the seventies, if ever it could be justified in the history of Canada. The industrial arts of the United States were in an advanced state, and there was a danger of flooding from Europe. It was, therefore, possibly necessary in that early period of our existence to protect these manufacturers. But as the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Motherwell) said in a speech in Swift Current, and as I also said, these infants have now become fathers with whiskers and they are amongst the dominant powers in Canadian life. I therefore do not believe that the argument in favour of protecting infant industries holds good to-day. Even in Great Britain, where they have had free trade, some of the greatest industries have been built up, yea, even in competition with the whole world.

Another argument that has been advanced by our friends in support of protection is the necessity for a home market. Of course, the home market is a splendid thing. We have no fault to find with Eastern Canada and the men that work in the factories; nor have we anything to say against the manufacturers. We do believe, however, that the home market is only a drop in the bucket so far as the great agricultural interests are concerned, especially in regard to wheat. For the next fifty years the Canadian farmer will have to grow wheat and other grains of all kinds, and raise cattle for the markets of the world. For that reason, therefore, the home market does not enter into the price that we are receiving at the present time.

We as Canadian farmers can grow wheat at 80 cents a bushel and place it on the world's market in competition with the farmers of all other countries. But in return, Sir, we claim the privilege in regard to the commodities that enter into the pro-

duction of our wheat, that we shall have the same opportunities of buying them in the world's market.

Of course, the argument is still being advanced: Where are you going to get revenue to run this great country? We need revenue and it is very difficult to get. The only question I should like to ask hon. members is: Who pays that revenue? Why, we are told by the greatest economic authorities in the world that 90 per cent at least of this tariff revenue is paid by the domestic consumers. So, Sir, we pay the revenue any way; but not only do we pay the revenue—we also make handsome gifts to those manufacturers who are protected as a result of that revenue being collected. Now, in regard to the economic factors that enter into world production, taking into consideration the demoralized exchange of most of the countries of Europe, and bearing in mind our domestic conditions, I can readily understand that it would not be advisable to have free trade at the present time; but I believe that it would be sound policy to have an all round reduction of the tariff for the good of our people generally.

I should like to deal for a moment or two with the tariff platform of the Liberal party. I believe that the Liberal party is more nearly in accord with us than is any other party—and yet I have my doubts. I have debated before this subject of tariff for revenue purposes only, and after carefully looking into the matter I find it very difficult to have such a tariff as will not in some measure protect the Canadian manufacturers. Yet we do not wish to revolutionize our trade practices, we do not wish to put our manufacturers out of business, as some people tell us is our intention. I do not believe that that is either possible or feasible. I believe that our manufacturers have just as much business acumen and ability as any of their competitors in Europe or the United States. Indeed it has been proved that the same men that enjoy this protection here can compete in the markets of the world. Therefore it seems to me fallacious to argue that it is absolutely essential to the prosperity of this country that we have high protection, and I hope that the historic Liberal party will live up to its ideals—ideals that have been manifested in the life of men of the stamp of Gladstone and Laurier, and that that party will give to our people legislation for the good of the people of Canada as a whole rather than for the advantage of the few.