

friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar). The Minister of the Interior seemed to get great satisfaction out of the thought that protection was one hundred and twenty-five years old in the United States. Well, that is a splendid Tory argument, although I never before heard one hundred and twenty-five years put down as the exact date at which institutions became at once venerable and invulnerable. Of course it appeared to me while this point was being made, that cannibalism is much older than that in the Fiji Islands, and yet the last man that I would expect to say anything in praise of cannibalism would be my friend the Minister of the Interior. Some one has put on record a great thought, to the effect that wisdom has been the general accuser of mankind, and I repeat the thought for the benefit of my hon. friend. I might add, off my own bat, that while wisdom has been the general accuser of mankind, error has never failed to advance its hoary head as the reason for its continued acceptance.

My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) went on to mention the names of some big men who in their day supported the principle of protection in the United States. I want to be perfectly fair with him. I do not know whether he was simply basing his belief in protection on authority, or whether he was only enforcing the point that these men would not have supported a policy which was not a truly national policy. I think there was a little of both designs in my hon. friend's mind. He is a consummate and astute debater, and he would be very glad, I fancy, if a certain number of our people would draw the inference that these authorities gave such sanction to protection that it would be almost an act of sacrilege to say anything against it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would rather take for my pattern the United States of to-day than the United States of one hundred and twenty-five years ago. And I must repeat, Sir, until hon. gentlemen get a true grasp of the fact, that when eight years ago President Wilson came into power he introduced what was really a very large measure of free trade. Our tariff was a monstrosity compared with the tariff of the United States. Only thirty per cent of all the articles imported into the United States bear any tariff at all. I am weary of repeating this statement, but I must continue to repeat it until hon. gentlemen fully grasp it. No one who knows anything about the conditions of life in the two countries will compare the tariff of the States with the tariff of this country. I need only mention boots

and shoes and agricultural machinery—these are admitted into the United States absolutely free of duty, while in this country they still carry a considerable duty; indeed, in the case of boots and shoes a very heavy one.

I would like to give my hon. friend a little information about the great Scotchman who became a great American—the late Andrew Carnegie. If he thinks that the so-called National Policy of Protection is a benefit to all classes, and wants to persuade intelligent workmen on this continent of that fact much longer, he will have to tackle just such a case as that of Mr. Carnegie. A poor young Scotchman, he came to the United States, and with the help of a protective tariff he amassed a fortune of \$500,000,000—I think that is about the sum at which he sold out his interest in the Pittsburg Steel Works. He has given away \$300,000,000 in charitable bequests. He who at the end of his life espoused free trade doctrines—having taken full advantage of protection, as any man is entitled to do, even if he does not believe in it—gave evidence before the Tariff Committee of the United States Senate to this effect:

When I sold out I had forty-three partners, and every one of them was a millionaire.

Now, if my hon. friend, with all his ability, will go down to the workmen at Pittsburg and tell them those two facts and say that nevertheless he believes that protection is equally good for the rich and for the poor, I imagine he will require even more than his ability to carry very much conviction among those people.

Why, Sir, just before President Wilson came into power there was a strike of the woollen workers at Lawrence, in Massachusetts. And what did they strike for, Mr. Speaker? They struck for a living wage. The woollen workers of Massachusetts struck because they could not maintain their wives and families on the wages they were getting in the same country which built up the Pittsburg Iron Works to such a degree of wealth that Carnegie and his forty-three partners were all millionaires. If I were a workingman I would need be greener than the green Englishman I am before I could believe that such a condition of things was equally good for me as for the millionaires.

Now, the hon. minister had something to say about exchange. I should just like to be permitted to give a little warning to the Government on this subject. I have never been able to get the Government to