

Come, they say, we give you the opportunity under our new platform. They say in effect to the manufacturers of cotton goods who have been protected for years: Come: we will take down the barriers that now preserve the home market of the cotton manufacturers of this country and that have enabled them to build up their factories; come in with your surplus products; we give you the opportunity under our new platform. They say in effect to the American manufacturers of woollen goods: Come and contribute a small percentage of your surplus, bring it over to Canada and sell it at slaughter prices, destroying the manufacture of cloths that has been built up in this country under the National Policy. Come and possess these markets that we throw open to you under a tariff for revenue only. They say also to the manufacturers of farm machinery, wagons and furniture: Contribute a small percentage of your surplus, and when we establish a tariff in Canada from which every vestige of protection is eliminated, come in and possess the market we have thrown open to you and destroy the Canadian industries which the National Policy has built up. Four years ago we were told by our Liberal friends that they were going to have the full run of the American markets under the policy of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. These fads—I suppose I may call them so—have gone to an early grave, unwept, unhonoured and unsung. Now, they are going to remove every vestige of protection under their tariff for revenue only. But what about reciprocity? Reciprocity, as everybody knows means the mutual interchange of commodities by any two countries to such an extent as may be agreed upon. They tried to humbug the people of this country a good deal about this cry of reciprocity, but I think they will not be able to do it much longer. If they introduce a tariff for revenue only, or free trade as it is in England, or a tariff from which every vestige of protection is taken, they will have nothing to offer the Americans with a view to bringing about such a desirable event as reciprocity. Now, Sir, I think I must read to you an extract from the speech of the hon. member for South Brant which applies so well to the question of reciprocity from the standpoint of a tariff for revenue only. Speaking in this House, in 1876, the hon. member said:

I am not one of those who believe in erecting a wall so high that you cannot trade with any other country, but I must admit that I am in favour of a defensive policy. I cannot view with complacency what I see going on in this country. We live beside a country with a population ten times greater than ours, whose industries have been fostered by protection until they are enabled, even in some articles in which Britain excels, to challenge supremacy with her. While that nation has erected against us and other countries a hostile tariff, we have our hands

bound, and give them a free and unrestricted right to trade in our markets. Fancy a commissioner, delegated by this Government and sanctioned by the British Government, sent to Washington to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. The question might be asked, what he desired. He replies: "I wish to have a free market in the United States for the products of our mines, our forests and our fields." Then the United States commissioner might ask, "What will you give us in return?" Our representative replies, "The free use of our markets for similar products of your country." The astute American would naturally say, "We have that already; I do not see that you offer anything." We must remember that we should have something to offer when we attempt to open up a new reciprocity question. I need not remind this House, that the great lever we had before in negotiating a reciprocity treaty, is ours no longer.

And, Mr. Speaker, I contend that when these gentlemen introduce a tariff from which is taken every vestige of protection, they will have nothing to offer, should they go to look for reciprocity, that the words of the hon. member for South Brant are even more true to-day with respect to this matter than they were when they were uttered in 1876. We do live alongside a country whose industries have been fostered by many years of protection, and extreme protection at that, and we require to keep our weapons in our own hands in order that we may have something with which to negotiate a reciprocity treaty should the Americans see fit at any future time to change their minds, and offer to enter into negotiations for such a treaty. And I cannot help thinking, Sir, that the hon. member for South Brant, as well as many other gentlemen of the Opposition, if they were frank with the people of this country, and frank with this House, would admit that what the hon. member for South Brant said is as true to-day as it was in 1876 when he uttered it. Now, Sir, we have had free trade advocated by the Liberal party; we have had unrestricted reciprocity advocated by the Liberal party; we have had commercial union advocated by the Liberal party, we have a tariff for revenue only and a tariff from which is to be taken every vestige of protection, advocated by these gentlemen. You would suppose, Sir, that when the hon. gentlemen attack the policy of the present Government they would think proper to show where it bears heavily upon any class in this country, that they would be prepared to show what article in our tariff is too high, what article in our tariff requires to be reduced. But, instead of that, they are content to deal in generalities. They find that the question of free trade, which they advocated at one time, is played out. They find that unrestricted reciprocity would not take with the people of this country, as neither would commercial union. They now bring forward a tariff for revenue only, which may mean, which does mean, nothing at all. They say in effect to the