

even though they are not going as fast as I would like to have them go?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I should like to say that a study of the politics of this country for the past twenty-five or thirty years convinces me that more reductions were actually secured from the high-priest Tories than from the low-tariff Liberals.

Mr. McMASTER: I would imagine that the applause to that sentiment was somewhat local. I would doubt very much if it came from those representing manufacturing interests in the splendid old province of Ontario. But there were a great many reductions made; duties running up as high as fifty and sixty and seventy per cent were reduced to ad valorem duties not running over thirty-five per cent. It must not be forgotten that there was also the British preference, and without being unduly antagonistic to the hon. member for Springfield, whose views on many questions do not differ very largely from my own, I would remind him that this British preference was fought in the most strenuous way by those high priests of Toryism from whom he states he received so many tariff favours, and they fought it because they said: You are interfering with the market which should be reserved for the Canadian manufacturer.

I would also like to ask my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) and other staunch free traders on the other side of the House, whether the reciprocity agreement was not a great step in the right direction, and whether the Liberal Administration of 1911, who adopted that policy and went down fighting for it, were not entitled to the sympathy of those who, we will say, hold sound economic views on tariff questions? The fears of the manufacturers of 1896 proved groundless. I would think, and hope, that the fears of the large interests in this country would prove groundless in regard to the introduction of free agricultural implements.

But let me note the very pleasant situation in which we find ourselves to-day in discussing economic matters, especially when these economic matters deal with the United States. You will remember that a few years ago if you discussed economic matters in connection with the United States with some sections of our people you frequently placed your loyalty as a British subject in jeopardy. But, now, how different it is! We find the Prime Minister himself coming before the House and in gracious fashion thanking the United States

for having sold so many steel plates to us at a price no higher than they were charging their own people.

Mr. MURPHY: And they are going to New York to consult the Finance Minister.

Mr. McMASTER: They have always gone to New York when it suited their purposes. It is only the other day that the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) told us that the United States and ourselves must fight this war as one economic unit. Six years ago, the friends of these hon. gentlemen were saying that if we adopted a certain trade proposition we would become an economic unit with the United States and then away with the Constitution, the Throne would tumble, and the Stars and Stripes would be substituted for the British flag. Really it is now very pleasant to be able to discuss economic questions without placing one's reputation for loyalty in jeopardy.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it not very pleasant to see Old Glory flying side by side with the British flag and the French flag? They were not flying together then.

Mr. McMASTER: It is splendid, and I do say for the political party with which I have always been associated, and with which I am associated yet, that we have never attempted to make political capital in the past by endeavouring to raise anti-American sentiment on the North American continent.

I respectfully suggest that it may very well happen that the fears of those who believe that their own best interests, and, indeed, who perhaps sincerely believe that the best interests of the country are served by the maintenance of artificial security through the operation of a protective tariff, are groundless. I know what the reply of these gentlemen will be, and it will be this: "We know our own business much better than any professional man who happens to be a member of Parliament, and we and not he must be the judge of what is best for us." In reply to this, may I make this observation? The federal reserve banks, created by President Wilson, have been a great success and have enormously benefited the United States banking system, but the bankers, before the law creating these federal reserve banks was actually placed upon the statute-book, almost unanimously condemned the proposal. They thought they knew banking much better than President Wilson, but President Wilson and his advisers knew what was best