

better than at points below the line. As you know very well, Mr. Speaker, the prices were so good that in some cases men made money, notwithstanding the duty, by bringing over wheat from below the line. And the general opinion of men who know much more of this subject than I do is that the prospect of touching it already greatly influenced for the worse the price of wheat in Manitoba and the North-west Territories even this year.

I wish to refer for a moment to the speech of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). I am sorry he is not present. I stated in an earlier part of my remarks that that speech was full of inconsistencies, and inconsistencies that are very suggestive in the light of what I have been reading. In the course of that speech he said :

It was not, indeed, until 1876, or about that time, that the question of a high tariff gravely occupied the attention of this House.

He goes on to say :

Now, I believe that Sir John Macdonald was as good a free trader as Mr. Mackenzie.

Well, Sir, I had the honour of intimacy with Sir John Macdonald and knew his opinion on every political question ; and I can say that the statement that Sir John Macdonald was a free trader and not a protectionist, which has been made by the Liberal press and by certain Liberals, for an object, I suppose, is without foundation. He was an enlightened protectionist and thoroughly honest in his conviction. No man, as those about me know, could make a sounder, more conclusive or more convincing protection speech than my late illustrious leader. The hon. the Finance Minister denounced the infant industries and said that "if the nursing-bottle be taken away from them they will immediately perish from the face of the earth." And he indicated that he would take it away. But he has not attempted to take it away, and it is there yet. Then, he denounced bonuses. He gave us a fancy description, a fine picture, of the old-fashioned workman who never dreamt of asking a bonus. But in the tariff which he was about to propose there was a bonus to the iron manufacturers. He says further :

I hesitate not to say that, if we should to-day, by some rash step, do that which some hon. gentlemen say we are bound to do, but which intelligent men know we are not bound to do, and would not do, we would not only break down the manufacturing interests of the country, but we would deal a blow at other interests of a wider and more serious character.

He shows that they would be perfectly within their rights if they were to treat the manufacturing industries—and I say they would—as having no vested rights whatever. Then, having given a bit of free trade clap-trap, he comes to action. The words are the words of a free trader, but the action is the action of a protectionist. He says, in effect : Some may suppose that we

are going to keep our promises, but intelligent men know us by this time, and do not expect us to keep our promises. There is another piece of inconsistency in this speech. The hon. Minister says :

I believe that there is nothing inconsistent with sound free trade principles in a government dealing with a neighbour, to hold in its hands whatever levers it may possess in the negotiations;—

And yet in this tariff he gives up the duty on corn, which would have been a powerful lever in dealing with these same neighbours, and gives up three cents on wheat, which also would have been a lever. And this is how he finishes this part of his speech :

--and I say so to-day, not in the spirit of retaliation, because I say, Sir, that we ought not to retaliate upon the United States in the way some people advocate.

Yet he retaliates upon them. While he says we ought not to retaliate he has in his hands a retaliatory tariff.

I have heard it argued that what we should do is to let our tariff stand as it is to-day. I cannot subscribe to that doctrine. The Liberal party has pledged itself to give tariff reform, and the country expects the Liberal party to fulfil their pledge.

And then they do not give the reform they promise. In connection with that, I have already read what the Prime Minister said about retaliation. We are told that this tariff especially belongs to him and that he is to be honoured in England because he is the author of it. And yet, he says he does not believe in retaliation.

I think that the country feels very much as certain carpenters felt when they marched through London on a celebrated occasion, when what was a sham reform was before Parliament, and they had a banner on which was inscribed : "Deal with us on the square ; we have been chiselled too long." Consider the promises of the hon. Prime Minister, of the hon. Finance Minister and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do not mention the smaller fry in that brilliant Ministry. But take the great men among them, take the leaders. When we take their promises and their performances, we feel like the carpenter, and the country must feel in the same way, that they have not dealt with us on the square, that we have been chiselled, and we want to know exactly where we are. I say there is in the character of the leaders, or of a few of the leaders, a sort of innate subterfuge by reason of which they cannot possibly make their conduct square with their professions. I have an article here in the "Reveil," written by an admirer of the Prime Minister, and it is a very extraordinary article. It goes over the history of the Prime Minister, and says that he was a disciple of Papineau. It gives you the policy of Papineau and the policy of 1854, and says of that policy :