

place I will assert that, as far as is concerned, leaving the system of Montreal—separating, possibly, Montreal from the country—the system of protection—the bane and curse of the bane and the curse of the bane. Now there is an easy way out of this. In a young country the increase of population is its prosperity. We have acres of land, to which we have the population of the whole world. It has been satisfied with a normal population, but have efforts to bring population down, and for the last twenty years confederation has existed. We have had hundreds of thousands every year in order to get rid of them. We had agents in all the great ports and flooded every market with goods, pamphlets showing the advantages of the bane and the curse of the bane. What was the object. But what came out in 1891 what? It showed that whereas in 1881, a period of great depression, our population had increased 17 per cent. the protection from 1881 to 1894 increased was reduced to 11 per cent. that, the record of increase of population in CANADA. Half a million souls, and yet ten years, from 1881 to 1891, brought into the country, the records of the department at Ottawa, no less emigrants, who had landed at Montreal to settle upon lands. The census returns show that the population had not increased in the extent of the 800,000, but lost the whole natural increase, besides 200,000 or more we had brought into the country. Was there ever such a thing as the Good Book that angel was once sent to burn of a wicked people, but turns show that the whole increase of the population was not conducted to the benefit of a man who will not say a word to emigrants, protect a bane and a curse? I will take the proposition from the point of view of the bane and the curse of the interests of Montreal and the rest of Canada. They are apart. What conduces to the benefit of one must conduce to the benefit of another, and if a proposition is not conducted to the benefit of Canada I have no hesitation that it cannot contribute to the benefit of Montreal. That well borne out by the facts. The population of Montreal in 1853, 237, and in 1894, 555,237, an increase of 39 per cent. so good. I want to distinguish fairly, and in order to be fair before you, I will come home to the judgment of what will give you what the population was in 1871 and in 1881. In 1871 it had increased to 165,000, but for the comparison we must deduct the increase caused by the addition of the city. So that in the population of Montreal in 1871, 140,000, and in 1881, 140,000, or 31 per cent., whereas in the decade it was 39 per cent. I must tell me, "here is the protection, here is the bane and the curse of the bane—the great reason was due to the development of the city itself. But the case. And perhaps I have a good many here when I talk of the development of the city. Here are the figures, and find in a very good book, the Montreal board of 1892, the semi-annual report, I may say in printed in the Montreal Board, I am sure, ought to give of orthodox in the hands of orthodox protectionists themselves are to be found in a page 91. In 1871, the population of the city of Montreal was 140,000, and in 1894, 555,237, an increase of 39 per cent. That was the REVENUE TAKING. figures under protection? after the inauguration of policy, the number of men employed in the city of Montreal was 10,562, an increase of 52 per cent. of 16 per cent. Thus in 1894 there was an increase of 16 per cent. as compared with an increase of 16 per cent. under a revenue policy. I have a demonstration as to the possibility that the population of Montreal is development of manufacturing in that city. But let us look at the capital invested in the

manufactures of Montreal was \$11,101,031; in 1881, after ten years of revenue tariff, that amount had increased to \$32,185,091, an increase of \$21,084,060, or 190 per cent. under a revenue tariff. What was it under protection? In 1881 the amount invested was \$32,185,091; in 1891 it was \$51,212,133, an increase of \$19,027,042, or 59 per cent. This shows a decrease in the amount of capital invested in manufactures from 190 per cent. in the previous decade to 59 per cent. in the decade under protection. Now I am told that a good deal of the capital subscribed and appearing in the figures of the board of trade during the regime of protection was watered and not solid. But even if it was watered it does not detract at all from the argument. I believe that nobody ever said that the investment of capital from 1871 to 1881 was watered, whereas in the other period they say it was. What is evident is that the development of manufactures from 1871 to 1881 was a healthy development under a healthy system, whereas the investment of capital from 1881 to 1891 was unhealthy, under an unhealthy system, and a GOOD DEAL OF IT WAS WASTED and is lost; and stockholders, in order to prevent greater loss, resorted to combines, restricted production, closed up their establishments, reduced the number of hands, and to-day what do you see in this city? You have thousands of men clamoring for work; you have hunger in thousands of homes, and private charity is unable to satisfy all the demands for relief. Public charity has to be organized. And all this under a system which professes to tax the people in order to give work to all who are willing to work. Can there be such a delusion, such a policy, such a mockery? And yet, in the face of such results, there are men to-day who still cling to that system. This is the system which they say has made Montreal the commercial metropolis of Canada. But I say here, on my reputation as a public man, that the record shows that if your city has developed, it is not protection which has developed it to such a degree. What is the cause which has made Montreal the great metropolis which it is? The cause is to be found in her wonderful geographical position. Why, the position of Montreal is unequalled in the world. Go into any one of the ports of Europe or America and you will not find such a city as Montreal which is at the same time a maritime and an inland city. New York, Boston and Baltimore are maritime cities, but they are not inland cities according to the orthodox fashion. They are on the coast, but Montreal is a sea harbor, one thousand miles from the coast. IN THE INTERIOR OF THE CONTINENT. And while Montreal is at the end of ocean navigation it is at the same time at the head of the immense system of inland navigation formed by the great lakes which constitute the interior of this continent and the like of which is not to be found in any part of the world. Look at the position of Montreal, situated at the head of inland navigation, Montreal seems to have been intended by the Creator Himself to be the distributor of wealth between Europe and America, and it is that position which has made Montreal what it is. It may be that my Tory friends will not be convinced. I would not wonder if it were so. There may be some doubting Thomases, but to that doubting Thomas, let me put his finger in the wounds, and let me give him a page of the history of Montreal. I say to-day Montreal is the great commercial metropolis of Canada, but it was not always so. Why, it is within the memory of men of the present generation that Montreal was, not very many years ago, simply a provincial town. What made her the great metropolis that she is to-day? Why, sir, in former times the river St. Lawrence flowed by its front as it flows to-day, but Montreal was not a sea harbor. Between Montreal and the ocean there were the shoals of Lake St. Peter, and that was a barrier, because the ships coming from the sea could not anchor in the harbor of Montreal. Two men there were in Montreal in those days, and whose sagacity, energy and perseverance Montreal owes much of what she is to-day. Sir, these two men ought to have their statues in the public squares of Montreal. They ought to have their images and portraits upon all the walls of our public buildings. These two men were Hon. John Young and Sir Hugh Allan, and to them it is that Montreal owes its present position. It was the efforts that the Hon. John Young that the shoals of Lake St. Peter were taken out; it was owing to his repeated agitation that at last in the year 1850 the first stroke was made to deepen the channel and to make Montreal a sea harbor, and three years afterwards, in 1853, THE FIRST STEAMER CAME from Europe and landed its cargo in the city of Montreal, and from that moment Sir Hugh Allan came with his steamers plying between the harbor of Montreal and Europe, carrying the products of America to Europe and the products of Europe to America. From that day Montreal went forward by leaps and bounds. The population of Montreal in 1850 was just 37,000. In 1861, after Montreal had become a sea harbor, the population was 90,000, an increase of 60 per cent., an increase unprecedented since or before, an increase unapproached since that time, but an increase to be approached and to be surpassed even when the channel has been deepened to 30 feet, as it will be by and by, and when the largest steamer can come into the harbor of Montreal and when the people of Montreal have realized the great possibilities of their harbor and taken a stand against any shackles being put upon trade. Then, sir, there will be another increase in the population of the city of Montreal. My words may carry perhaps no conviction, but let me give you the opinion of an American authority, Mr. Edward O'Brien, who was commissioner of navigation in the American government under the presidency of Mr. Harrison. Some few weeks ago he

published an interview in the New York Times reviewing the whole question of transportation between America and Europe, and in this interview he speaks of your city and harbor of Montreal. I invite the closest attention of you to all this. The facts which I give you are not new to me, but they are present in a condensed form. The facts are not new, but in war it requires one thousand bullets to kill a man, and it may require a thousand repetitions of the same argument in order to destroy some fallacy commercial or otherwise. Mr. O'Brien speaks as follows: "From Liverpool to New York is 3040 miles. From Liverpool to Montreal is 2790 miles. From New York to Duluth (via railroad to Buffalo) is 1437 miles, and via the Erie canal, 1517 miles. From Montreal to Duluth via the St. Lawrence is 1354. From Liverpool to Duluth via Montreal and the St. Lawrence is 4144 miles, which is only 600 miles more than the route via New York, and 83 or 84 miles more than the route via New York, 4177 miles, or 4577 miles, according as the route be via the New York Central railroad or the Erie canal to Buffalo. Montreal is 250 miles nearer Liverpool than New York is, and 83 or 84 miles nearer Duluth. From Liverpool to Duluth the route via Montreal is 333 or 413 miles shorter than the route via New York. Let us translate these distances into dollars and cents and see what commercial advantages the Canadians may realize on the completion of the great eighty-three and a half million dollar water route from the great lakes to the seaboard." That is the advantage of Montreal. Now perhaps someone may tell me we can have all this without protection; and some will say, it will come to the same thing whether we have protection or not. I say that you cannot have the benefits of that trade to the ocean unless you have return cargoes coming from Europe, and there is nothing surer than that protection destroys maritime trade. There is no fact that is surer than this. It has been proved by the experience of all nations. Let me again quote the authority to whom I alluded a moment ago, that is the authority of Mr. O'Brien, upon the result of protection upon the AMERICAN MARITIME TRADE: "We have lost the ocean carrying trade. We once carried a large trade for other nations, and the bulk of our own exports and imports in our own vessels. But our shipping has dwindled both actually and relatively compared to other nations until we now depend almost entirely upon foreign ships. Since 1858, the proportion of our foreign trade carried in our own vessels has dwindled from seventy-three and seven-tenths, to twelve and two-tenths per cent., or five-sixths." That has been the result of protection on the American traffic. Now what has been the result of a different system and a different policy. In England, for instance, let me give you the figures, I have given you the result of protection on the result of the American maritime trade, and now let me give you the result of the freedom of trade upon the English maritime trade. I quote from an article recently published in the Boston Globe and very carefully compared: "Fifty years ago England controlled one-third of the carrying trade of the high seas, but now it controls more than one-half, or literally possesses 55 per cent. of the carrying power of the world. Its tonnage of vessels increased from 3,310,000 tons in 1840 to 10,230,000 in 1892, or 210 per cent. It has increased steadily with a greater ratio of gain than that of any other country the past ten years, or from 5.3 in 1882 to 56.6 in 1892." That is the result, sir, of a different system. Now, I ask every man here how best will Montreal take advantage of its situation? Montreal, situated as she is, at the end of ocean navigation and at the head of inland navigation, how best will she take advantage of her situation? Will she best take advantage of it by a system of protection which will kill her maritime trade, or will she not best take advantage of it by REMOVING THE SHACKLES FROM TRADE as far as it is possible to remove them. I gave you a moment ago the names of Sir Hugh Allan and the Hon. John Young, who have been the makers of Montreal, but long before the days of Sir Hugh Allan and the Hon. John Young, two hundred years before them, there was a citizen of Montreal who had a glimpse into the future of the development of this city. I refer to the very famous name of Robert Chevalier de la Salle. He realized what would be the greatness of the city of Montreal some day. He had heard of a great river in the west, which he supposed was connected with the system of the great lakes, and which he also supposed entered the Pacific Ocean, and to which, as he imagined, it would be possible to bring the trade of the Orient by the city of Montreal. He went in search of that river. His surmises were not found correct; the river did not open into the Pacific Ocean, but into the Gulf of Mexico. However he found an immense territory of land of the most fertile nature under the sun, and his vision showed that land inhabited by teeming millions, and the commerce of that territory much greater than the commerce of the Orient. And if he were to come back again to life he would find to-day on one side of the lakes the province of Ontario, the Province of Manitoba, the Northwest Territories, and on the other side the state of New York, the state of Ohio, the state of Illinois, the state of Wisconsin, the state of Michigan, the state of Minnesota and the state of Dakota. And in these states and territories he would see millions of men of the Anglo-Saxon race, the great commercial race of the world; he would see a trade larger than the trade of the Orient, and he would find these stretches which he traveled in a birch bark canoe now traversed by all the facilities which modern science can give. But he would find against all this, that while trade is coming naturally through this great waterway, the people of Montreal are putting obstacles upon their trade, and sending

it back towards Europe, and the centre of the continent. Now, it seems to me, that for all these reasons you can appreciate that the policy of the city of Montreal should not lie in the way of the restriction of trade, but in the way of the expansion of that trade. The policy of the city of Montreal should not be in the way of contraction of trade, but in freedom of trade. That is what I am here to argue, and that is what I am here to propose to you to-day. Before we go further I would like to place under the gaze of the Conservatives present a page of their own history, a page of a very recent history, a page with reference to the introduction of THE SYSTEM OF PROTECTION into this country. Now I appeal to them to speak out their minds on the question is it not a fact that when protection was introduced to the Canadian people, in the opinion, nay in the very language of Sir John Macdonald, and of Sir Charles Tupper, and of all the authors of protection, was never intended that protection should be a permanent institution. Did they not tell us that protection was only to be a temporary measure in this country, and to use the language which was then made use of, "to give a lift to our manufactures in order to enable them to meet competition from abroad. Let me ask you is this not a fact? Gentlemen, you know that that is the case. I defy anyone to point out to me any person in France, in the United States, in any other protectionist country where the promoters of a protectionist tariff came forward with their policy and at the same time said to the people that it was to be a permanent institution in the country. On the contrary, every statesman who brought forward such a policy always said to his people, "This is only to be a temporary policy; we must lay a little extra taxation upon the people in order to give a lift to our manufactures." This was always the first shape of the introduction of a protective tariff. And what was the second shape? The second shape turned out to be the same in Canada and everywhere else. I defy any man to point out to me any person in France, in Germany, in the United States, in any protectionist country, I defy him to show me any protected industry which was not introduced as a temporary protective industry in the first place, and about which it was not said that after a while it would stand on its own legs. The day never comes in the minds of some when a protected industry can stand on its own legs. I can understand that is human nature, but what I do not understand is that those who introduce a protective tariff and who introduce it simply for a time, at last get intoxicated with the poison of their own doctrine. They are just like the man who commences to drink moderately, and who becomes a slave to the habit, and his friends that liquor is indispensable to his health. So it is with THOSE PROTECTED MANUFACTURERS. Further, I insist that the policy of the Conservative party was not intended to be permanent, and a man who ought to know, Mr. Dalton McCarthy, who was deep in the councils of his party at that time, and who has then looked upon as the best here that if the old Chief Justice has declared over and over again that the leaders of the Conservative party never intended to saddle forever the people of Canada with a protective tariff. I say to the Conservatives who may be present here that if they were to go back to the policy of their party, they will have to adopt that policy which was told to them by one of the greatest of their then leaders. But Sir John Macdonald has disappeared, Sir Charles Tupper has disappeared, and the men who are now in power made a lame effort last session to remove to a certain extent the shackles which are now weighing upon the people. They made the effort, I say, but the effort was not strong for their strength, and they did not come back. Now, sir, I may be told again: "Do you pretend that if we were to abolish the system of protection that our manufacturers can live in the city of Montreal?" Why, sir, I certainly do pretend it. I contend that the manufacturers of Montreal can do better under a revenue tariff than they can do under protection. (Cheers.) I myself am not much of a manufacturer, I am a lawyer, and perhaps my advice will not be taken with relish by those who are not of the same mind as myself, and they may say to me: "Oh, it is all very well for you to say so, but what do you know about the business?" Well, I have read something. I do not manufacture, but I HAVE READ SOMETHING AND every morning I read the Montreal Gazette, which is something. You need not laugh, gentlemen. For my part, I read the Gazette every morning. I breakfast upon it. I will not say that it is absolutely wholesome food, but I am like Mr. Atholbriety, I am a poison proof, having read the Gazette for so many years. I have read in the Gazette the statement that if you remove protection, raw materials would be no longer free. I say that if we were to have a revenue tariff raw materials would be free. Raw materials are not free to-day under the policy of the Orient. And if he were to come back again to life he would find to-day on one side of the lakes the province of Ontario, the Province of Manitoba, the Northwest Territories, and on the other side the state of New York, the state of Ohio, the state of Illinois, the state of Wisconsin, the state of Michigan, the state of Minnesota and the state of Dakota. And in these states and territories he would see millions of men of the Anglo-Saxon race, the great commercial race of the world; he would see a trade larger than the trade of the Orient, and he would find these stretches which he traveled in a birch bark canoe now traversed by all the facilities which modern science can give. But he would find against all this, that while trade is coming naturally through this great waterway, the people of Montreal are putting obstacles upon their trade, and sending

Canadian protectionist. Germany for the Germans is the motto there, and you know Prince Bismarck, who was in NEVER DID THINGS BY HALVES. About the year 1880 Prince Bismarck was in power and they had an infant industry in Germany at that time. In 1880 that was not exactly an infant industry in years, for it was already 70 years old, but it was still an infant industry. It is a characteristic industry, you know, of all infant industries that they never grow and that they always remain babies. Beet root sugar was that industry in Germany. In 1880 that industry in Germany was seventy years old, because, as you are aware, it arose from the continental policy under Napoleon, when Napoleon was fighting against England and when they closed the ports and harbors of France, of Italy, of Belgium, of Holland and a part of Germany against British goods, and against colonial sugars consequently. Then the French people and the German people, who no longer eat colonial sugars, commenced to grow beet roots and to make beet root sugar, and after seventy years the German people and the French people were still protecting beet root sugar by enormous protective duties. In 1880 Prince Bismarck undertook to give still more protection to the refineries of beet root sugar. He put enormous import duties on sugar, but not satisfied with that, he placed upon the export of German sugar to foreign countries enormous duties. He gave to the refiners of German sugars enormous bounties on every ton they exported. Thus protected with an import duty and an export bounty the refiners of sugar were able to flood the English market with German sugars, which were retailed up on the counter of the English trader at a price actually lower than the cost of production. Now, I admit, that this was a very serious matter for the English refiners of sugar. There was German sugar in competition with their own, and on account of the taxes imposed on the German people it was sold to Englishmen actually lower than the cost of production. England is a free trade country, but human nature is everywhere the same, and so the English refiners went to the government. The government at that time was in the hands of Lord Salisbury. It was a Conservative government, but in England, Conservatives and Liberals are all alike, they are all free traders. No one would dare to AVOW HIMSELF A PROTECTIONIST in England. The English refiners put their complaints before Lord Salisbury. They represented they could not compete with the German sugars which were actually sold to English mechanics at a price below the cost of production. Well, Lord Salisbury said in effect to the deputations of refiners: "Do understand you gentlemen, you tell me that in consequence of the export duties paid by the German people to the refiners of German sugar that this German sugar is sold to-day to the English people at a price lower than the cost of production. I do not think the English people have very much to complain of after all. And if the German taxpayers will tax themselves in order to supply the English consumer with sugar, I think that the English government should have done just the same as the English refiners and gone to the government to lay their case before Mr. Foster, the minister of finance." I have told you what was the answer of Lord Salisbury to the English refiners of sugar, but do not think that the answer of Mr. Foster, the Canadian finance minister, would have been the same to a Canadian deputations of sugar refiners under similar circumstances. Mr. Foster would have said: "Why, gentlemen, will you tell me that these German sugar refiners have the audacity to bring their sugar and sell it in Canada at a lower price than the cost of production? Oh, gentlemen, that will never do. Canada for the Canadians and Canadian sugar for Canadian mouths, and we will have duties levied to prevent German sugar from coming in to INTERFERE WITH CANADIAN REFINERS." Let me ask you, gentlemen, which is the wiser of the two opinions, that of Lord Salisbury or that of Mr. Foster? Which do you suppose is the better policy? Is it the policy of Canada which taxes her people to give them a dear article of food, or is it the policy of England, which says: "We are ready to profit by the whole world, and if they give us anything free and cheap we will take it." I think the policy of England is the wiser one. But what took place in England when the sugar refiners got this answer from Lord Salisbury? The sugar refiners did not pine; they did not lament; they did not weep. But, as true Britons, they went to work and they converted their machinery so as to make it useful for the manufacture of jams and preserves and they bought the cheap German sugars to manufacture them. They not only bought the cheap German sugars produced at the expense of the German taxpayers but they converted them into jams and jellies and preserves and they sent them back to Germany at a great profit to themselves. Now, Montreal is in the same position. I will tell you what I would do about that, but before I tell you what I will do, I will tell you what the Con-

servatives will do. The Conservative party are the great loyal party of Canada as you know. Whenever they are driven to the wall and beaten in argument, they have an argument of their own to use upon their opponents and they say to them: "You are not loyal and we are the great loyal party of this country." But their loyalty is only lip loyalty. They don't go for their example to Great Britain. Oh, no, why should they go to Great Britain for their example. One of their ministers, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, told us during last session of the floor of parliament that England was in a state of decadence, and that England's prestige and supremacy as a commercial nation was gone. He told us that the trade of England was driven from all the civilized ports of the world, and that she had to place her wares and goods by force of arms upon helpless savages and poor barbarians. That was the language of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper. That is not Liberal loyalty, of course. That is Tory loyalty, but thank heaven it is not Liberal loyalty. I do not always proclaim my loyalty, but, sir, although I am of French origin I am a Liberal and of the English school. The men of the Liberal party go for their example not to Germany and not to the United States, but they go to the land which has been the pioneer of freedom in every sense. THE PIONEER OF FREEDOM in religion, the pioneer in civil and commercial life as well. It is to Great Britain we look for an example. But, gentlemen, the Conservative party would not do that, they go to Germany and the United States. You know, gentlemen, that these things are repeated, and will be repeated every day by the Tory party. Do you think that that is the way to make a nation rich and wealthy? Do you think that this is a way for a nation like ours to meet the battle of life which must ever end by the survival of the fittest? Which is the best policy for us to follow? Is it the sound common sense of England, which takes its sugar wherever it comes from, at the lowest possible price, or the policy of Germany, which, in order to maintain its infant industries, takes the money out of the pockets of the German people and puts it into the pockets of the German sugar refiners? There is no use pursuing that argument any further, the policy of England is the common sense one. I now come to another argument which seems to weigh very much upon the minds of our Conservative friends, although I must say that it has never disturbed my head. The Conservatives do not sleep soundly about it, and they ask you every day in the Montreal Gazette and the Empire, and all the Conservative papers and all the Conservative organs say to you, "Oh, and if you are going to reduce the tariff how are you going to get the revenue?" This is the question which seems to bother the Conservatives very much, and during the peregrinations of the ministers before the death of Sir John Thompson, while they were visiting the Maritime Provinces, Sir Charles Hibbert, among others, laid before the people of those provinces a most doleful picture as to what was to happen to them if we had a tariff for revenue purposes only. He told them that in such a case we would have a heavy taxation upon our servants, and carriages, and dogs, and guns, and in general language he pictured to them all these great hardships which I am sure must have sent a thrill of horror into the hearts of his listeners. Gentlemen, it is not necessary to make any very serious argument to answer that question. We are asked how are you going to raise a revenue, and the answer is simply this: "BY HAVING A TARIFF FOR REVENUE." The tariff that we have in Canada to-day is not a tariff for revenue, and I could quote to prove this the words of Mr. Foster, the finance minister, which he gave utterance to not later than last session of parliament. Mr. Foster then said: "The other and third method is the protective tariff by which you select a certain list of articles and place upon them certain rates of import with a view to raising a certain amount of money for the services of the country, but more especially with this view, that while you raise the amount of money that is necessary for the country you must stimulate the development of the resources of the country." Gentlemen, you have it here plainly stated that the object of the tariff is not to raise a revenue. That is only an incident of the protective tariff, but the first object of the tariff is to raise money so as to develop our infant industries, that is to say, to raise taxes not to place in the treasury, but to place them in the pockets of certain favored classes and individuals. Now reverse the principle. Have a tariff not for protection, but simply for revenue, and it is quite clear, nay, it is as plain as can be, that with a lesser amount of duties, you will have more revenue than you will have under the present system at the present time. If it is my good fortune to visit the Maritime provinces, I will be able to tell to the audiences that were addressed by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper that they need not fear the taxes of their mainland of sound government and sound servants, or their carriages, or their guns or their dogs; though I must say in passing that it would not break my heart at all if they were to make the swells who can afford carriages and man-servants, and gun and dogs, contribute their due share to the revenue of the country. Now, sir, there is another and a very serious question. I have told you that one object is to have a customs tariff based upon the principle of revenue only. How is this to be effected? As far as the settlement of that question goes we are met between two extreme sets of men. We are met by those who fear that we will go too far and by those who fear that we will not go far enough. We are met by those who fear we will move too rapidly