

that have ever been in any tariff. As I have shown by quoting a list of things at 35 per cent, they have made no effort whatever to arrange a lower tariff on the articles that the poor man buys. The Prime Minister further said :

Our programme is for a customs tariff upon the basis of revenue, and nothing else.

But that is not all ; when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) went to Prescott he was accompanied by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was the spokesman for the Liberal party on fiscal questions, and at Prescott the Minister of Trade and Commerce was eloquent over broken promises, and the present Prime Minister was eloquent about the same thing. Well, Sir, they say that hell is paved with good intentions ; the sunny ways of the present Prime Minister are strewn with the barren brambles of worthless promises. This is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said :

He objected to the establishment in this country of a privileged class to tax the people for their own benefit and to give no return to the people for it. Were the people put in possession of the knowledge, through the Public Accounts, of the taxation that they were compelled to pay for the benefit of the sugar-refiners and cotton manufacturers—

And now we have the duty raised on cotton manufactures, especially that class which the poor man wears.

—and the iron smelters—

And we have a bonus for the iron smelter—

—and for favoured individuals, they would sweep the whole system away to-morrow.

I hope that the people will take the hon. gentleman at his word, and march on Ottawa, and sweep away as well those who are continuing it. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) then said :

The farmers had evidence that the promises made in 1878 had not been fulfilled, and that the whole system of protection had failed. At the evening meeting, Mr. Graham presented a brief but effective argument in support of the policy of a revenue tariff.

And then we had the member for Leeds and Grenville :

Mr. Frank T. Frost, of Smith's Falls, arraigned the National Policy, and pronounced it a flat failure.

Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) was fighting on velvet. He had assurances that he would not be hurt, and that he would be placed by the Liberal tariff in a better position than he was by the Conservative tariff. Under the present tariff not only has he the same protection on his manufactured goods as he had before,

Mr. DAVIN.

but he has his raw material on more advantageous terms.

The present Prime Minister declared in 1887 against retaliation. He said on that occasion :

The ministerial press, the salaried press, and consequently the press which represents the ideas of the Ministers, declared that the people of Canada did not want any trade with the United States, if the latter feel that way. But retaliation is not free trade. The policy of the Conservative party is one of retaliation, but the policy of the Liberal party should be one of friendship and good-will towards the United States.

And yet, Sir, what have we to-day from these gentlemen, but a policy of retaliation ? Then the present Prime Minister, when in Opposition, and asking the people to place him where he is at the present time, in 1882, moved a resolution against the coal duties, and spoke as follows:—

Well, then, if the hon. Minister assents to this position, and his followers also assent to it, why do they legislate against nature ? They will tell me that the Americans also legislate against nature.

What speech did we have this afternoon from the Controller of Customs (Mr. Pater-son) ? He pointed to the Dingley Bill, which is, according to the Prime Minister, legislation against nature. And what did we have from the Finance Minister ? He said things had changed—the United States were not in the same mood as he alleged they were in 1893. They were legislating against nature, and we must do the same. But the Prime Minister, when on this side of the House, said :

Can this reason ever be given in a civilized country, that because one nation legislates against nature, we should also legislate against nature ? The hon. gentleman reminded me of what is said of the Chinese mode of duelling. In Paris, where duels are frequent, a man who is offended calls his adversary out, and they settle the matter between themselves ; but in China, if a man is offended, he commences by opening his bowels, and when this is done, the bloody sword is sent to his adversary, who also opens his bowels, so that, instead of one man going to the grave against the laws of nature, two men do so.

On this continent, instead of having one nation legislating against the laws of nature, you have two pursuing that course.

So that because the Americans are disembowelling themselves, our hon. friends on the Government side disembowel themselves too, and contrary to the promises they made. I have further statements made by the present Finance Minister, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the present Prime Minister, when they were looking for votes, when they were holding themselves out as the proper persons to administer the affairs of the country, and were therefore making promises and pledges to the people. Here is what the Finance Minister said in 1894 :