

States 24.83 per cent, while on the other hand, the rate of duty on the total imports of the United States is 28.91 per cent, and on dutiable goods it is 49.83 per cent, or, more than double our rate in each case. As has been already pointed out, the United States has nearly three-fourths of the total importation of free goods into Canada, while Great Britain has to be content with some 15 per cent. One would expect that if we intend to maintain and build up our own products and manufactures against such powerful and tremendous competition as that which we must anticipate from the United States we would fix our tariff of customs against that country on a scale at least as high as is that of their tariff against us.

That is to say, we must have the American tariff. This is adequate protection. Forty-nine per cent is the American tariff, so that in order to be consistent and to build up our industries, we must have a tariff of 49 per cent against the United States. This is the policy of my hon. friend such as it was set forth on the floor of the House, and here in the east. But, during the recess my hon. friend went to visit the North-west. If I may be permitted to say so, I congratulate him for having done so. I have no doubt that the people were pleased to have an opportunity of seeing and hearing the new leader of the party and it was right that he should come into contact with them and right that he should visit these new communities. But, if his friends have reason to be happy over his visit his opponents have also reason to be gratified that he took that course, because, there is no experience like the experience of having to speak before different communities in different parts of the country to show the character of a policy, whatever there may be in it of good or bad. As my hon. friend proceeded westward, as he commenced to sniff the breezes of the prairie, as he inhaled the fragrance of the new ploughed soil, as he gazed upon the immensity of the new wheat fields, as he came in contact with the hardy settler, who has hewed civilization out of the desert, his ideas expanded with the views of the horizon before him, and when he came to Medicine Hat the medicine had already had its effect upon him, and I am happy to say—and I give him my compliments for it—new ideas had already sprouted under his hat. To the people of Medicine Hat he spoke, to the hardy settlers he came to preach the new gospel of the Conservative party, and here is the language he held. You have heard the language he held here on the floor of parliament, advocating a Canadian tariff of 49 per cent against the consumers of Canada. But, that is not the language he held to the people of the North-west Territories.

His policy was one of reasonable protection to all Canadian industries, and he was prepared to say this before any Canadian audience. Competition amongst Canadian industries had resulted in a marvellous reduc-

tion of prices, and he did not think the people of Canada would suffer by a moderate protective tariff. The Conservative party was in no way bound up with the interests of the manufacturers and he could tell the people in all sincerity that the Liberal party had received during the past six years, and was receiving support from the manufacturers. He was well applauded on taking his seat.

I believe so, but I do not know that he would have been so well applauded when he took his seat if he had advocated the American tariff of 49 per cent. We can make a comparison between the language he held here and the language spoken to the people of the North-west Territories. What a difference there is between the self-sufficient policy of 49 per cent in the east and the meek, moderate, humble, apologizing, protective policy given to the people of the North-west Territories! It is true the hon. gentleman is still in favour of a moderate tariff to keep the foreigner out so that the manufacturers may be cooped up in a small pit so that they can not viciously cut into each other's prices and the consumer may have the benefit of a lower tariff. Is this the boasted sincerity of the Conservative party when they speak of the policy of protection? It is one thing in the east, it is one thing in the west, and there, Sir, is the condemnation of the policy of the hon. gentleman and the vindication of the policy we have on this side of the House.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend never said a word on an important subject that is mentioned in the speech from the Throne; that is to say, the new Redistribution Bill which must be introduced during the present session. We have to introduce that Bill and we will do it, not of choice, but of necessity. The necessity is imposed upon us by the letter of the constitution. We know from the experience of the past, we know from the history of former Redistribution Bills, that there are several ways of introducing such a measure, but if there be several ways of introducing it there is only one way which ought to be accepted by the Canadian parliament; that is to say, the honest, fair way, so as to give no favour to anybody and to injure nobody. I have here a statement which has been placed in my hands of 42 counties in Ontario which at the last election returned 25 Conservative members and 17 Liberal members, whereas, in these 42 counties the popular vote gave an actual majority as recorded to the Liberal candidates. In these 42 counties 88,365 votes were cast for Liberal candidates and 86,392 were cast for Conservative candidates, showing a Liberal majority of 1,973 votes—result 25 Conservative members elected, 17 Liberal members elected; and majority of votes in favour of Liberal party; majority of seats in favour of Conservative party. That is the fairness of the redistribution that we have had before us for twenty years. The objects