

But that, they said, was no excuse—if the United States were fools enough to have a high protective tariff that was no reason why we should be fools also. A while ago they maintained that high protection in United States was no excuse for high protection here, but now that they are in power they make high protection in the States the excuse for higher protection here. Moreover, they argued that the consumer pays the duty. That was a part of the creed of the Liberal party, I believe. If that is true, what nonsense it is for them to talk about having a high protective tariff against the United States. But I venture to say that they know that in a great many cases the consumer does not pay the duty. Perhaps they did not know it before; I hope they are learning; I suppose they are, since they got into power. I believe that in a great many cases the consumer does not pay the duty, and that when we levy a protective tariff against the United States, it does not follow that we pay higher prices; it does follow that articles from the United States are kept out, or if they come in, must come in at a lower price than we should give for them if we had no protection. I will not go on to repeat what was said about protection being a curse to the country. These are matters we all understand. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite hardly meant all they said. I am sure they do not mean it to-day. They say to the manufacturers: Here we have given you a protective tariff. But what do they say to the free traders? They say: Look at the reciprocal tariff and see what a reduction we are making to you; we are in favour of free trade; we are going in the direction of free trade, and this reciprocal tariff is in that direction. They say more. They say that this reciprocal tariff is a preference given to Great Britain, and they take great credit for that. I do not want to deprive them of any credit they may be entitled to. But how do they give this preference to Great Britain? They say: We offer the same to every nation of the world. When we tell them that, under the treaties, they cannot give a preference to Great Britain, they say: We are not giving a preference to Great Britain. And yet, in the same breath, they say they are giving a preference to the mother country and they take great credit to themselves for that. This article that I have read from the "Witness" says that this tariff hits the United States, and for that reason people will be pleased with it. How does this tariff hit the United States? This Government says: We want to hit the United States; how shall we do it? They decide to take the duty off corn. That is a strange way to hit the United States, but they do it. But they are not satisfied to hit the United States once, they must do it again and so they take the duty off binder-twine. But to hit the United States twice is not enough, they must get another blow. And

MR. CRAIG.

so they take the duty off barb wire. To hit the United States once again takes some consideration. But, after considering every opportunity, they decide to take some of the duty off coal oil. Of course, that does not hit the United States very hard. So they reduce the duty on wheat. As the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said, that is something nobody asked for. But they wanted to hit the United States, and so they reduce the duty on wheat 3 cents a bushel, they reduce the duty on flour 15 cents per barrel, they reduce the duty on iron, and in doing all those things, they are hitting the United States. Well, now, I do not think that the United States objects to be hit in that way. I think if the Government keeps on hitting them that way, they will be quite satisfied. Yet hon. gentlemen say that in this tariff they are retaliating against the United States. But they are not satisfied with that. One would think they might be satisfied when they hit the United States so often, but they are not satisfied, they are going to hit the United States again under certain conditions. And what do you think they are going to do? The Finance Minister threatens to put a duty on anthracite coal. Now we have no anthracite coal in this country, and if we put a duty on anthracite coal, we will raise the price of coal to the consumers all over the country. The people all over this country will have to pay more for hard coal. If this 50 cents a ton duty is put on it, it will raise the price, perhaps, that much, and perhaps not quite as much, but it will raise the price. And so they are going to hit the United States. If they put up the duty to 75 cents on coal they are going to hit them by making the people of this country pay more for coal. Now, I think this is a strange way of hitting the United States, this is a strange way of retaliating; but the Government say they are going to do all this. Now I hope they will not put a duty on anthracite coal. I know the idea is spread over the country that the United States is making a high tariff and we want to retaliate, we want to show them that we are independent, that we can do without them. But after all I think it would be rather foolish to put a duty on anthracite coal. It is not as if we had anthracite coal in our own country, we must get coal from them. Therefore, I would advise the Government to be satisfied with the way they have hit the United States, and not put this duty on anthracite coal, no matter what the United States may do. Now, I intend to consider for a few minutes this resolution about preferential trade. I consider this a dangerous resolution for the reason that it places too much power in the hands of any Government. I do not care what Government it is. If a Conservative Government were in power, I would say that this is a dangerous resolution. Although a supporter of the Conservative party, I would not want to have such