

employment and monopolies? If there were mergers and monopolies in this country, why did not he and his administrative co-partners use their regulating and destructive power upon these mergers and monopolies? But it is not simply a hard and fast tariff that causes mergers and monopolies and unemployment. The United States tariff is altogether too high; and to compare that with the tariff of Canada is not a fair comparison—ours with 25 per cent on the average, theirs with 43 per cent on the average; or, taking sections, ours on wools and woollens with about 30 per cent, theirs with from 90 to 92 per cent. The exaggerations of tariff exaggerate the difficulties in the United States; but we in Canada stood a poor chance of having less monopoly and less effects of monopolies by opening our resources to the monopolists of the United States than we do by holding to our moderate tariff with our regulating and controlling powers upon it.

The voice of the 21st of September, my right hon. friend says, was the voice of passion and prejudice. Do not let my right hon. friend run away with that idea. There was no discussion of the economic question, said my right hon. friend. Very little or none of it, said my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. Are they sincere in that declaration? I can only say from my own experience that I travelled this country fairly extensively, and spoke very assiduously, as often as I could and as long as I could stand it, and I am here to state that I never made a speech in the campaign in which there was not from three-fourths to seven-eighths of it, my best attempt at economic argument. I cannot say that I made a first-class economic argument, though I tried my best to do it; but I made it, and made it because I thought it was one of the strongest points we had, and I believe that to this day. I did touch the National question and the question of our Imperial relations. I would have considered that I had not done the duty I owed to my hearers if I had not touched those two points, because they were inextricably tied up with the proposal with the United States of America.

But, said my right hon. friend, you have done a bad thing because you have spoiled the prospect of peace arbitration. Why does it limp to-day in the United States as between the United States and Great Britain and as between the United States and France? Not because of Canada's action, as my right hon. friend knows. It halts because a portion of the Senate of the United States refuses to give life and vitality and power to Mr. Taft's arbitration treaties. I have greater respect for the sensible people of the United States than to think that because an independent country to the

Mr. FOSTER.

north of them exercised its manly right to say what it thought about a trade proposal, therefore the United States is any the less inclined to friendly relations with the people of Canada. Not less friendly, but more friendly will be our relations unless such advocates as my right hon. friend impress upon the people of the United States that we did an unfriendly Act when in reality we were acting according to our lights for our best trade and national advantages.

Now, I want to see my right hon. friend live up to his professions. In the campaign that has just ended, and in many campaigns preceding, my right hon. friend has made this one claim for his long political life, that he has always acted as a peace-maker, that he saw in this country factions, races, creeds, sectional diversities, and that if he has done any thing in his thirty-five years of public service it has been to cement together all sections of the country and to do away with these acerbities and prejudices. It is a noble ambition for a statesman to work up to; it is a noble claim for a statesman, when his life of statesmanship is drawing toward its close. What I want to ask my right hon. friend to-night is not to mar that claim of his by persisting in doing what he has started out to do on two occasions already in this House—lighting the flames of dissension between different parts of this country, between the east and the west and between different sections of the country in the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario. What good statesmanlike end is served by the attempt of my right hon. friend to sow the feeling in the minds of the people of the west that their interests are utterly at odds with those of the people of the east? What good end is served by trying to pick out from the debris of that feeling little differences between Nationalists at one period of their life and another or by making it appear that there are differences between members of the cabinet? I have so much respect for the claim of my right hon. friend and the work of many years of his many years of statesmanship that I would like to see him drop that course and deal with greater questions.

Now the naval question has been referred to to-night and I do not intend to deal with it at any length. Let me tell my right hon. friend a thing which follows as a corollary from a statement made by the Premier. In 1896 when my right hon. friend came into power there was one great question—great to him and all his followers for 18 years. What was it? It was the reform of the tariff. You remember it. Everybody remembers it. For 18 years he and other gentlemen with him had declared that protection was a curse and a bane, and