

States? He has attacked the tariff, and I submit that if my right hon. leader follows the example of these hon. gentlemen and sets up serious arguments about this subject, neither his actions nor his arguments should be made the matter of jollification as they were in this House to-day. Inconsistency on the part of the right hon. gentleman only proves him to be human, but he is, at any rate, following the example of great statesmen both in Great Britain and in the United States, in the course which he has taken, and I submit that amongst all the events of the recess probably the event which most particularly affects the destiny of Canada and which will certainly affect the thoughts of Canada is the fiscal revolution which has been carried out by the President and the Democratic party in the United States. When I first came to this country and dared, I hope always respectfully, to give my opinion upon tariffs, I used to be regarded as a sort of benighted islander who had strayed somehow out of my proper path and the one recipe for my complaint was that some gentlemen on the other side of the House got up and said: Look at the great country to the south. I see the hon. member for York (Mr. McLeod) still gets lessons from that great country, because he quoted it in one particular in his speech to-night. Well, I looked to the great country to the south and I kept on looking, and now I turn to my hon. friends opposite and I say: Look at the great country to the south and what do you see? We see a great, simple and sincere man coming into office and cutting up protection and tearing its economic fallacies and false arguments into shreds and casting them to the four winds of heaven. There is no argument by which protection has been supported anywhere that he did not expose and we see that man with the approbation apparently of the whole people, because there is one peculiar thing about this reform: both Republicans and Democrats recognize that they have a statesman who means business and they are prepared to give a fair trial to what he has introduced. My right hon. friend in discussing this subject used an argument which I did not think worthy of him. It is an argument which is being sent out, canned (probably from the Manufacturers' Association), and which is appearing in little country newspapers, proving that there has been no reduction in the price of foodstuffs in the United States since the reduction of the tariff. I put it to my right hon. friend, if forty years of the National Policy here and

sixty years of high protection in the United States were needed before the people would take a fair dose of free trade, is it fair to free trade to expect it to produce a revolution in two months? A reduction in food stuffs is the very reduction which would not come at once. How could it? The moment Mr. Woodrow Wilson lowered the tariff a yearling could not become a three-year-old steer. I wish they could have. It would have been a very profitable business for me in Alberta, but it takes two years for a yearling to become a three-year-old. I could give my right hon. friend shoals of advertisement from the business men of the States showing that upon the other articles on which the tariff was reduced, prices came down immediately the tariff came into operation. Wannamaker's had a page advertisement in the New York papers mentioning the articles upon which their prices would be lowered the day the tariff came into effect. So I say the argument of my right hon. friend is scarcely worthy of him. This fiscal revolution in the United States has made it impossible for us to have reciprocity as it was proposed two years ago. I think everybody will recognize that as an absolutely necessary outcome of the change in the United States, but it does not follow that reciprocity is dead. It means that fifty per cent of it is very much alive and in operation on the other side of the line. I see the Minister of Finance making a note on that subject. I dare say he will tell us once more that reciprocity is dead. I very well remember when he first told us that. It was in his maiden speech. He said:

As far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I may say that practically all classes were against reciprocity—farmers, manufacturers and artisans. And, sir, when a verdict is got from such a province as that, is it not the part of wisdom to accept it?

I have a conundrum for my hon. friend in connection with that quotation. When Ontario changes its verdict, what is our duty? There have been two elections in Ontario recently which have shown that they are not sure that they took the part of wisdom. They have cut down the majority in Middlesex lower than ever before, and I hope we shall hear from the member for South Bruce that reciprocity was made an issue in his county. After all it is not the name, it is the thing I care for. Reciprocity is a term applied to mutual trade arranged by governments; but while that may fall through, the cry of 'no truck or trade with the Yankees' can never be raised again, because the trading between the two peoples has risen by hundreds of thousands of dollars since the pact was defeated.