

is the general tariff, have a look at it, we have not reduced the duties, but have left them in a great measure as they were before. Keep your eye on that tariff and we expect you to support us. Then they turn to their friends who are in favour of a revenue tariff, and to them they say: Do not look at that general tariff, but at this reciprocal tariff. Keep your eye fixed on that all the time, and you will be satisfied. That may seem a little exaggerated, but when I went home, a few days ago, I heard of a case exactly in point. A gentleman who is an ardent supporter of the Liberal party, who has grown gray in supporting them, who would not listen to any arguments at all to show that there was anything good at all in the Conservative party, went to a friend of mine who was a Conservative as soon as he got the general tariff, and he was thunderstruck. He said: I am so disappointed, I never thought our party would do anything like this, and he went away disgusted. But after a while he came back. Oh, he said, it is all right, here is this reciprocal tariff—and he went away perfectly happy. He saw a way of getting out of it. That is a very ingenious arrangement to suit all parties, and I congratulate the First Minister and those who devised the scheme on their success, if only they can keep it up. It is all right so long as you can keep each man's attention confined to the one tariff that suits him, but if one man looks at both tariffs and compares them, he will wonder where he is at and what the thing really means. To show that what I say is not at all exaggerated, let me read a small selection from a newspaper which, while it calls itself independent, is a supporter of the party opposite—the Montreal "Witness." I once took occasion, in my early political career, to say that the "Witness" was a Liberal organ, and it repudiated the soft impeachment entirely and said it was independent. Perhaps it is independent, but it leans very strongly in the direction of hon. gentlemen opposite. I notice that in this article in the Montreal "Witness" that came out the day after the tariff came down, the 23rd April, it said that the tariff was better than they had feared, that the most important part of the tariff was the reciprocal part, and that in reading it, as a whole, and in reading every clause of it we must remember this reciprocal feature. They wrote that way because they were writing for members of the Liberal party who expected a greater reduction than they got. They go on to say:

In order to appreciate it as a free trade measure, the tariff reformer must grasp the fact that its vital clause, that containing the principle of preferential trade, lowers the tariff immediately 12½ per cent, and at the end of a year from next July an additional 12½ per cent all round, so far as the British Empire is concerned, as well as those countries having a treaty with Great Britain, treaties containing the most-favoured-nation

clause, of which the principal are Germany and Belgium.

This is for the free trader. Now, a little further on in the same article, I find the following:—

The form of the tariff is made somewhat more free-trade fashion by the substitution of ad valorem duties for specific duties, but in its multiplicity of classification it remains, as before, protectionist in form.

That is a very good article; it is both a free trade and a protectionist tariff. That is what I say is the great characteristic of this tariff—it faces both ways. Now, they must have some reason to give their supporters for making or keeping this tariff a protectionist tariff. What reason is given? It is that the United States is making a high protective tariff. Now, what does the Montreal "Witness" say in the same paper?

It will show the British people that the story of British disloyalty in Canada was untrue. It also strikes a blow at the United States, and, as they have struck a blow at us, most people will like it for that reason. Mr. Fielding was ready to deal with the United States, but until the negotiations take place, he keeps most of the duties on goods from the United States as they were.

So that is the great argument—that the United States are making a protective tariff and that, therefore, we are justified in making a protective tariff. I have here a selection from the "Globe," but, as hon. gentlemen on the other side all read the "Globe" for themselves, I shall not trouble the House by reading that extract to them. But I may say that it is a very strong argument in favour of protection against the United States. It is a very satisfactory and very conclusive argument, to my mind. It shows that we especially need a high tariff against the United States because their manufactures are so large they have their specialists in the various lines, and it says that if we had no taxes on American goods, the manufacturer of New York State could control our markets as easily as he controls that of his own state, and if we had not a protective tariff our young men would be sent in ever-increasing droves to the United States. That is a good argument to me, a protectionist; but I am very much surprised at the "Globe" addressing arguments like that to a party who denounced protection consistently year after year as long as they were in Opposition. But I suppose we need not expect consistency from hon. gentlemen opposite. The Liberal party, in taking the stand that the Dingley Bill is an excuse for a protective tariff, here forget that during part of the time the Conservative party were in power the McKinley Bill was in operation. They forget that the McKinley Bill made as high a tariff as the Dingley Bill will be after it passes through the Senate of the United States, perhaps higher.