

would have done if they had been in power. But it seems to me that the action of hon. members when they had the opportunity to do something is the best answer to the policy they are advocating to-day. My hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) emphasizes that line of policy, not only with regard to France, but with regard to the United States. Again and again he tells us that if we want to trade with the United States we must have something to trade with. He emphasizes that policy and he takes up the old line "No truck or trade with the Yankees." That is the substance of it. But not long after he made a speech along those lines the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson) suddenly asked this question: "Why is this government not reducing the duty? Why do they not reduce the duties on American automobiles?" Which of these two policies represents the attitude of the Conservative party to-day? Is it my hon. friend from West York, who wants to jack up the tariff against the Americans, or is it my hon. friend from Halton, who wants to cut down the duty on Yankee automobiles? I think I have a right to ask my hon. friend to define which of these two policies is the correct one. My hon. friend from West York gave us quite a lecture on potatoes. I think there is no other item in his review which occupied so much of his time as potatoes. I want to refer to it, first because he regarded it as important, and secondly because it is an amusing incident. The item reads as follows:

Potatoes when imported from a country which imposes a customs duty on potatoes grown in Canada per 100 pounds, British preference 20 cents; intermediate, 35 cents; general tariff, 35 cents.

My hon. friend went on to speak at considerable length on this potato question; he referred to the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) as having something to do with it, and he said:

The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), I think has been helping them a little along the line of instructions. I do not know how he managed this; he certainly managed to get them to pick out the one item that would constitute the smallest reason in the world to move an American business man in the right direction. But, perhaps, the process of education will go on. He has got them to put a protective duty on potatoes when other countries maintain a duty against potatoes grown in Canada. I do not know why we should not eat Canadian potatoes. I always thought we should. I think Canadian potatoes are very good.

And then, in consequence of his reference to the hon. member for Carleton and Victoria, that hon. member (Mr. Caldwell) said:

Since the hon. member has coupled my name with this, I should like to dissociate myself with it entirely. We want free entry of our potatoes into other markets.

Then the hon. member (Sir Henry Drayton) continues:

Wonderful! Is the attitude of this hon. gentleman not extraordinary? I am not going to debate the matter; but I am going to tell him one thing, that his attitude is just as helpful to the potato producers of New Brunswick as was his vote on the Crownsnest pass case. If he wants to make it impossible to do business, all right; but hon. gentlemen across the aisle—

I believe that he meant the members on this side of the House. Then he continues:

—were learning something, and they put this duty on potatoes. Let us suppose that this duty on potatoes was imposed for some good cause. If there be any good cause, the reason why potatoes should be picked out as a specific instance, must have regard to the American tariff. The one potato scale I know of that is worrying Canada to-day is the American potato scale.

He went on to speak at some length in that direction and said:

Certainly it is a fine point to start with if they are serious in the desire to tackle the question like men of business. Undoubtedly it is a fine trading point as compared with the millions, the hundreds of millions, of values that come from the United States into Canada; it is small, for example as compared with the millions which we get from them in silks, textiles, iron and steel products, etc. It is simply small and contemptible.

That was my hon. friend's criticism. He referred to it as a small and contemptible item. I have pleasure in telling him that, if that item is small and contemptible, it is no baby of mine, it is not an item of mine, but it is taken from the tariff as he left it when he went out of office. This item he has dwelt upon, which he thinks we have selected as a small, contemptible item, is simply taken from his own tariff in its very words, and we have carried it into the new tariff. While the tariff previously, as my hon. friend left it, had a rate of so many cents per bushel, the law of Canada requires that potatoes shall be sold by weight and not by measures, and we simply convert it from the number of cents per bushel into the number of cents per hundred pounds; and that is the whole question. Nevertheless, my hon. friend characterizes it as a small and contemptible thing, and says that it is a specimen of the way this Liberal government is doing things.

Reference was made to the duty on artificial silk as something which creates a departure from our own line of policy. Let us examine that for a moment. That is a new article which is not yet classified in the tariff. As it is likely to be widely used, it ought to have a classification, and we have placed it in the tariff and so we have to say what rate it would bear in the tariff. Artificial silk is after all silk, practically. It serves all the purposes of silk. It will displace silk as far as