

a power placed in the hands of a Conservative Government. I consider it dangerous, because the decision as to what countries come under this clause, is left to the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council. Now, I think that is a great mistake. Not only that, but if there was a tariff specifying what any country must come to in order to come into this arrangement, that would be all right, but no tariff is specified. There has been a good deal of dispute about those words in this resolution "a tariff which, on the whole, is favourable." Now, it is a great point to find out what that means. Suppose, for instance, the United States said: We will admit your lumber free, but we want you to admit us to come in under this favoured clause. Now would this Government say: You can come in under this favoured clause if you allow one or two articles to go in free, which are exported by us. Would the Government be justified in saying that? Sir, it is a very serious question, and I hold it is a dangerous thing to intrust any Government with such a great power. For that reason, if for no other, I should be compelled to oppose this resolution. It might be worthy of consideration if, as I said, some duties were specified as the limit to which the Government could go under this clause; but when nothing is specified, when it is left so indefinite, when the whole matter is left to the decision of the Controller of Customs, subject to the Governor in Council, I think it is a most dangerous thing to intrust the Government with such power. Now, what is the result of that? The result is that the whole tariff, and all the manufacturers of this country, are placed entirely at the mercy of the Government. I want to say further, that this scheme is not a preferential scheme to Great Britain, but it looks to me like the thin edge of the wedge to destroy protection altogether. The Liberal party have promised to destroy protection, and while they have not done it yet, and while they do not pretend that they are going to do it, yet I believe that some day they will carry out their pledges if they can. Sir, it is impossible to hold that any body of men can have made such pledges, can have made such solemn declarations on the floor of this House, can have made such declarations all over this country to their supporters, and can have been elected on those pledges, and now turn their back on them. So it seems to me that this scheme of preferential trade, as it is called, is just a scheme to enter the thin edge of the wedge and take protection out of the tariff altogether. We find that all nations are invited to enter into this arrangement. I was reading an article in the Montreal "Witness" which said that it may turn out that Germany, and Belgium, and these other nations have a right to come in under this clause. Well,

if they have, says the "Witness," the consumers will get the benefit. Then the "Witness" goes on to say: We would not be satisfied long to allow a highly protected country like Germany to have these benefits, and to refuse those benefits to our kinsmen of the same language to the south of us. While the Montreal "Witness" may not be in the secrets of the Government, still no doubt its editors have a pretty good idea of its policy. The danger is this, that in a short time almost every nation will enjoy the benefits of this preferential clause in the treaty, because the Government are to be the judges as to what nation shall come in and what shall stay out; and while today we find them talking about this Government being against the United States, and while I have shown that they are hitting the United States very hard in certain ways, yet I know what their feelings are towards that country. I remember how they have talked about the United States, how they have ridiculed the idea of going to Australia to build up trade and neglecting the republic to the south of us, and I well know how their thoughts turn in that direction. The "Witness" echoes their opinions no doubt when it hopes that before long the United States will come into this arrangement.

I am in favour of a true preferential trade arrangement with Great Britain, a truly reciprocal arrangement. This is called a reciprocal tariff. I repeat that I am in favour of true reciprocity with England, but I object to this pretended preference, because it is nothing but a pretended preference. I venture to predict that before long we will find other nations are included, and that Germany, Belgium, and twenty-two other countries, and no doubt the United States, will come under and reap the advantages of this arrangement. So this is not in any sense of the word a preferential arrangement with Great Britain. I have no doubt that a great many people will like the idea of entering into a preferential arrangement with Great Britain; it gives vent to their loyalty, they feel we are part of the Empire, and think that it will bind the Empire closer together. If that arrangement were confined to Great Britain, no doubt such would be the case, but if it is extended to almost all the nations of the earth, I do not see how it can have the result of binding the colonies to the mother country and assisting in the consolidation of the Empire. So I object to this pretended preference. It may be said that it is very strange that hon. members on this side of the House, who have talked so long about loyalty should rise and object to this scheme: that while we have always been saying we are loyal, when this great advantage to the mother country is proposed, we turn around and raise objections. But we object because we say this is only a pretended preference, not a real preference to Great Britain. Speak-