

the hon. member for Pictou rise in his place and say to me: You would be justified in increasing to Canadian manufacturers the duty on ore, coal, coke and other materials, without increasing the British preferential rate also? What would be the effect of this upon the great industry in the constituency of my hon. friend the member for Pictou? It is perfectly obvious that the British manufacturer would get in his coal free, his coke free, his ore free and his raw material free, and if I did not increase the British preferential rate as well as the general rate, I would destroy these Canadian industries. I said once before in this House, and I say now, that I am not here to destroy; I am here to construct and to build up. Take the case of hides and tanning material. Does anybody mean to say that we are not obliged to increase the British preferential rate upon leather when increasing the duties on hides and tanning materials? In what position would the leather manufacturers of Canada be in, if, having to pay an increased duty upon hides and tanning materials, they had not the benefit of the British preferential rate upon their finished product in order to put them on a parity with the British competitor in this market? The same thing applies to woollens. If, for the reasons which I have given, I increase the duty upon foreign wool, dyestuffs and other material used in the woollen industry, must I not increase also the British preferential rate upon the product of the woollen manufacturers? I could give instance after instance of a similar nature. Take the cotton spinning and weaving industry. Could manufacturers of these products afford to pay  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent duty on raw cotton if the yarn and fabrics produced in Great Britain from similar material were allowed entry at customs at the British preferential rates in force previous to February 11? I think I have, therefore, sufficiently disposed of the arguments advanced by my right hon. friend with regard to my fiscal proposals in so far as they relate to the British preference.

I have been abused with respect to the action of the Government in the matter of the British preference. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) the other night invoked the Deity; he said: "For God's sake, keep your unholy and disloyal hands off the British preference." He challenged us that night to appeal to the country, and I observed the next morning—without surprise—that the clock in the tower had stopped during the night. My hon. friend knew his man. He and I are on terms of amity and friendship; if he had addressed that remark to the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), the evening could not have ended without tragedy. He felt safe, however, in accusing me of having unholy hands and of being disloyal. He knew that I knew I was not disloyal; and I knew that he knew that I knew that he was not disloyal, and no harm resulted. But it is not a very desirable thing to be called disloyal.

#### BEHIND THE MEN IN THE TRENCHES.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) said in the debate on the Address—and I adopt the sentiment that he expressed: "Let the Government place itself behind the man in the trenches." That is what this Government has been doing and intends to do. From the outset I said as Finance Minister—and my leader has said it before me—that our first business is war until this war is concluded. Shall we send our flesh and blood to the front and boggle over a matter of taxation necessary to maintain them there? Our object, as I have said, is to raise money for the prosecution of this war, either directly or indirectly, and I believe the people will pay it cheerfully, loyally and patriotically.