

before we arrive at it. On some days those proceedings consist of boring operations. On other days we strike a gusher. This has been one of the gusher days, and perhaps not so tedious on that account.

Coming to the actual question before us, I may say that this is not the time to discuss it in much detail. It is the general policy of the Government which is before us. To my mind the strongest justification of that policy is the manner in which it has been received by the Opposition. To use the language of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) on another occasion, this policy appears to have fallen like a bombshell in their ranks. They have been at a loss how to criticise it. In fact, up to date there has been hardly anything worthy of the name of criticism from that side of the House.

The hon. member for York, N. B. (Mr. Foster), the financial leader of the Opposition, has taken a sneering tone. The hon. leader of the Opposition, who has to play second to him in a financial discussion, has taken the growling tone. The member for York has taken the yah-yah line of opposition; the leader of the Opposition has taken the bow-wow line. The two hon. gentlemen seem to have different conceptions of their own individuality and of the line they ought to take in this discussion. The member for York has been long misled by his own natural advantages. His undoubted resemblance to the ordinary stage presentation of Faust's creation of Mephistopheles in the drama of Faust has led him to believe for a long time back that he could play the part of a sneering spirit in that immortal drama. It seems to have been his opinion for years back that he is the very Mephistopheles in debate—that he could play the very Mephistopheles with the arguments of his opponents.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no such work as "Faust's Mephistopheles."

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend has tripped me up when I did not trip, for I specially mentioned the drama of "Faust," written by Goethe, in which this character occurs. This hon. gentleman, who plays the part of Mephistopheles with the arguments of his opponents, works up his sarcasm in his hands just as a farmer's wife might work up a pat of butter in the old days before we had the latest butter working machinery; he rolls it and pats it between his palms; and finally offers it to the House on the tips of his fingers, and expects that to end the whole question. That is the line of the Mephistopheles of debate.

The leader of the Opposition, on the other hand, seems to fancy himself in the character of the favorite old watch-dog, who growls whenever the interests of our poor suffering industries are in his opinion attacked. He is always on the watch to bay the Government, or the

moon, or anything else that he thinks threatens the interests of those suffering industries. We have seen him on a former occasion ready to fight—yes, ready to die—for a particular principle which was before the House. It is hardly more than a year since on the floor of this House he declared himself ready to die for the sake of carrying the Remedial Bill then before us, the policy which since the opening of this session he has dropped his interest in, and surrendered it to the enemy. So the sincerity of his growl in defence of the suffering industries may be subject to a little doubt on this occasion.

These gentlemen see ghosts in the tariff, because, as they see opposite things in it, the things they see can not really be there. The member for York believes that this is a protectionist policy. He thinks he sees in it the ghost of the old clothes he used to wear when Minister of Finance—the ghostly rags and tatters of the National Policy clinging about the form of this tariff; and he objects to that. He does not like to be revisited by the ghost of the National Policy. The leader of the Opposition, on the other hand, thinks he sees in it free trade in sheep's clothing, so to speak. He thinks he sees in it the introduction of the thin edge of the wedge of free trade. About twenty years ago I had the pleasure of hearing that hon. gentleman denounce a policy introduced by a Liberal Government on this side of the House, because he said it introduced the thin edge of the wedge of protection. So that it seems he is always seeing the thin edges of wedges in any policy introduced by a Liberal Government; and his opposition does not depend on what the nature of the wedge is, so much as on the personality of those who introduce it. I am happy to agree with him in this particular instance to some extent. I believe this tariff is a step in the direction of freer trade, at all events, though it can scarcely be called a free trade tariff; and for that reason I am the more inclined to give it my support.

But all this discussion around and about the tariff, for we can hardly call it a discussion of the tariff, leads us to speak of the methods of tariff making employed by the two parties who have had control of the business of this country. The National Policy, as introduced by Sir Leonard Tilley in 1879, was admittedly the product of Yankee experts imported from Washington for the occasion. There was nobody in Canada who knew the ins and outs of protection sufficiently to frame a tariff for the Conservative party at that time. The tariff endured in substantially the same shape until 1887. In that year the tariff was the sole production of the autocrat himself who now leads the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), a man, I cannot say of blood and iron, although that tariff was emphatically an iron tariff, but it may be correct to