

open to the demands of the privileged monopolies rather than to the needs of the people.

The increase also in the duty on raisins is bound to raise the price of a very necessary commodity. "Oh", but you say, "we will get them from Australia." The raisin and current industry in Australia is still simply in the experimental stage, and in any case the Australian people do not have to sell those commodities any cheaper than the Californian price on which we shall have to pay three cents per pound.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) declared that the trade of Canada is passing through a very serious, a very critical time, made critical by the fact of that trade having been established by a tariff. He blames the tariff for that. Yet the government of which he is a member is giving the same privilege to an industry about to be set up in Canada for the first time for the manufacture of artificial silk. After operating for one year, this industry will be entitled to the same consideration as, he says, applies now to all other industries established under the tariff. In other words, this new calf raised on the tariff cow, in forty years time will still have to be fed from the same source. I have never yet heard an advocate of protection put up a logical reason why a trade penalty should be imposed on any article of commerce, particularly the necessities of life. But even from a protectionist standpoint, is there any logic in encouraging the copper industry by a bounty and, at the same time, placing foreign copper on the free list? I am a free trader, but I am trying to look at this from a protectionist standpoint. I confess the ways of the protectionist mind have been a closed mystery to me for a long time. Evidently there is in this an attempt to please the home producer as well as the manufacturer.

This afternoon a change was made in the duty on sugar. To my mind the sugar combine needs no protection. The same gentlemen who to-day control the price of sugar in this country, very largely control the credit to the Cuban producers, and they are able to raise or lower the price of the raw product just as they see fit. As I state, they need no protection.

Some of my hon. friends to my right would like to see, in the words of the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) a tariff commission, so that we could have a scientifically constructed tariff. There can be no such thing as a scientific tariff. No man who has given any thought to that subject will ever try to reconcile the two words "scientific" and "tariff." He might as well

try to say that the Atlantic ocean was dry as to apply the word "science" to the tariff. Science aims at the vindication of natural laws, while tariff taxes are devised for the express purpose of circumventing natural laws as regards trade. A tariff for revenue is just as contradictory, except where it is levied on goods that are not made at home. Great Britain raises revenue by a tariff, and the Conservatives do not forget to tell us about that; but their tariff is placed on articles of luxury and those which are not produced in Great Britain. The British people, after about seventy-five years of the freest kind of trade in the modern world, will not allow the skinning process to go on that our taxpayers are subjected to.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond), speaking the other evening, declared that the tariff is not understood by some of us who undertake to discuss it. He informs us that it is a study in natural psychology whatever that means. I want to inform my hon. friend that one thing we on this side of the House know quite well, is that the tariff is a privilege given to one class. Somebody has to pay for that privilege and we know very well who pays for it. If it is simply the hallucination of a disordered mind, as he suggests, I submit that that state belongs rather to those who fancy a tariff confers a right by law to get something for nothing, than to those who are plundered. It may be said that all citizens, all city dwellers, doctors, lawyers, mechanics and others, are taxed alike to bear the burden of the tariff placed upon other classes; but the doctor, or the lawyer, or the mechanic sets the remuneration for his services according to the cost of living. Even the working man, the labourer, through organization, is able to maintain the same high rate for his services, and still to pass the tariff tax on to someone else. That someone else, more particularly than any other in this country, is the farmer, and since his price is set for him by the open markets of the world, he is not able to pass on to others the unjust burden that the manufacturer of the commodities he needs places upon all other classes. The farm products of this country must be sold in competition with the product of all the cheapest labour throughout the whole world, including Europe and Asia alike. The United States farmers have been disillusioned since the Fordney tariff has been placed against us in that country. I want to read an extract from an editorial I received the other day because nothing better exposes the fallacy of the protective tariff. Look at it