

debit side, and that the results of many years of prosperity will be wiped out before the debt, the loss, is made up from the unsettlement of our trade.

When we come to count the cost there is another thing that we must take into consideration, and it is that this proposition, if it becomes law, is the inevitable abandonment by Canada of the principle of protection all along the line. There are no two ways about that. Since 1879 we have built up this country under protection; we have diversified development and diversified employment. We are making an all-round nation, and we have been committed to that policy until this time. Now, protection to have any possible excuse, any logical defence, must be claimed by all and granted to all classes of the community. You cannot make fish of one and flesh of another. You cannot say to one class of the community: There is no protection for what you produce, and say to another class of the community: We will maintain the protection on what you produce. If you remove all protection from agriculture and leave no protection whatever for any of the farmers throughout Canada, how long do you suppose the farmers of Canada will be content to allow the manufacturers to have protection if they can have none? How long do you suppose the farmers, whose produce is open to the competition of the whole world, will consent to pay the price of protection for the articles they use? That same feeling actuates the farmers on both sides of the line. Just let me read to the House a few clauses from a resolution that was passed at the National Grange meeting, held on the 4th February in New York. The National Grange represents a million farmers in thirty states. Here is part of the resolution:

The Bill provides for the admission free of duty of all Canadian farm products. Since Canada is the only country from which any considerable quantity of these products can under any circumstances be imported, this would result in practically free trade in everything the farmer produces.

While putting farm products on the free list the reciprocity Bill make no material reduction in the high tariff rates on all the manufactured articles the farmer buys, and therefore gives no relief from the heavy burden of taxation imposed by these duties.

The theory on which our protective policy has always been defended is that all classes and interests are equally entitled to protection.

Then further down it reads:

We hold that the farmers should receive exactly the same measure of protection as is given the manufacturers, and that there must be no reduction of duties on farm products either by reciprocity or tariff revision, unless the duties on all manufactured articles are at the same time correspondingly lowered.

Mr. AMES.

Just at the same time there appeared in the New York 'Evening Post' this significant editorial. It was addressed to the Democrats in the hope that the Democrats might facilitate the passage of this agreement through Congress:

Tariff revision is not likely, even on general principles, to lose favour by scoring an initial victory; people are apt, when they have got a part of something they have been trying for, to be all the more eager to get the rest. The fact that they have got the bars down for butter and eggs and wheat will not tend to reconcile them to buying shoddy blankets and clothes at prices that would pay for woollen ones if the tariff were out of the way.

Remember, this is in the United States.

But in addition to this, there is a special reason for not being afraid that reciprocity will kill tariff revision. How about the farmers in the border states who are squealing now over the threatened competition of Canadian producers? When their share of the tariff has been taken away, is it likely that they will be as well satisfied as they are now to help feed the other beneficiaries? Will they vote to stick to the high tariff for the manufacturers when they must be content with little or none for themselves?

What is said on the other side of the line is said, in this same strain exactly, by the farmers of this country. Just another instance; by a stroke of the pen salt is made free. There is invested \$1,500,000 by the Windsor Salt Works in western Ontario, a company which has a pay roll of \$60,000 each year. Their salt is now made free, but they still have to pay the full duty on their coal, which is their raw material. Do you tell me that if the people who have been engaged in that protected industry for years, find their protection wholly removed, they are going to continue to advocate protection for others? That will be what the farmer would say, and we will have the butter maker, the fruit grower, the vegetable grower, the salt manufacturer and a great many others saying: If there is no protection for me there shall be none for the rest of you. If the outworks of protection are stormed it will not be long until the citadel will come down as well. The government has been saying to the manufacturers: Do not disturb yourselves; you will not be affected, but the government is opening up a stream, the volume of which it will be unable to check after it has once commenced to flow. You have rendered the position of protection illogical. You have made it class legislation. You cannot have free trade for half the community and protection for the other half. You open flood-gates that you cannot close, and you will find that if this reciprocity treaty goes through there will be no stopping the flood until the last vestige of protection in Can-