

as well as in natural products with the United States. I am not going to be a carping critic about words, but I may say that a man with the great experience of the hon. member for South Oxford might, I think, have used more scientific phraseology than "the most extended trade relations." Why in one phrase he could have given us the statement that what we want is absolute free trade with the United States. Remember, the most extended trade relations—however, that is mere hypercriticism, and I never descend to that. (Laughter.) To begin with I object, as I believe others before have objected in this debate, that that language is vague. He says we should reduce the duties. How far? By one per cent.? By five-sixths of one per cent.? By 20 per cent.? By how much? Surely in a resolution of this kind, which is to go before the country, which is intended to influence the people and be a text on platform after platform, you should have given the people something definite. But the main necessities of life—what are these? Why not mention them? They cannot be many. But it is the main necessities of life for the farmer, the artisan, the fisherman, and the miner. Visions of fish hooks, of iron, of agricultural implements, of bread, cheese, bacon, a whole lot of things come before you. (Hear, hear.)

On what does the hon. gentleman want the reduction? Is it on bread? He cannot suppose that we want cheap bread in this country when we export so much wheat? Is it iron? My hon. friend from Addington (Mr. Dawson) spoke of iron. It sat upon the hon. gentleman's soul that the duty on iron was not reduced, or that it was not let in absolutely free. Suppose we take iron. Are you going to reduce the duty on that? Very well. Then we come to the second part. You want to reduce the duty on iron, and then you vote on the resolution that you want the most extended trade relations with the United States! What does that mean? Will anyone dare to say that you will not have to build up a wall against the importation of iron on the seaboard exactly equal to that which they have in

the United States? They want unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. But the leaders in that country have declared: "Do you suppose we are fools to allow you Cannucks, and the Britishers through you Cannucks, to deluge our country with goods from Birmingham and Sheffield? No; you must have a tariff like our own." Then, what does the hon. member for Addington and what do all the rest of them want? (Cheers.) We have now a duty of \$4 a ton. What will they have to pay when this wall is raised? They will have to pay a duty of \$6 a ton. (Hear, hear.) That reasoning applies to other articles *pro tanto*. I ask under which king? I interrupted last night, I think not offensively, the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) by asking him, how can you do this and have unrestricted reciprocity? One after the other has spoken on that side, but not one has explained how you are going to have these duties reduced and then go into a trade partnership with the United States, for that is what it amounts to.

Some hon. members. No.

Mr. Davin. No? I see that some hon. gentlemen can make a cuckoo cry over those benches, but not one of them, when challenged, can dare to show how they are going to do it. The leader of the Opposition is there. He is an experienced politician, he is a distinguished lawyer, he is a man of subtle intellect. I defy him to show us how he is going to do it, and I say to him that, if he can show how it can be done I will vote for his motion.

Mr. Laurier. I told you you were boasting a few minutes ago.

Mr. Davin. You are not boasting now, because you are evading the challenge. (Loud Ministerial cheers.) Show me how you can have unrestricted reciprocity with the States without affecting your tariff on the seaboard. You ought to have shown it, and the member for South Oxford ought to have shown it when he tabled that resolution. But when we challenged him, what did he say? He said, in his peculiarly effective manner: I have not been called in as a physician, but when I am called in, then I will prescribe. The

he
ph
ci
th
ca
wh
ha
he
an
to
wh
nor
don
any
ing
ref
the
the
(Re
gen
hav
has
suff
ther
to b
and
a liv
get
equa
sion
swal
not
neve
But
swal
the
fresh
nees
step
is we
(Loud
is M
the n
He g
this a
all c
tax-p
admit
that t
but,
produ
series
phen
Mr.