130 and not only did the representative of England find no reason to recede from our system, but the representative of France, and also, I think, the representative of Holland, actually came to the conclusion that they would do well to abandon the uniform duty and come over to the system of classification.

Now, so far as authority is concerned, that is, I think, a very considerable mass to which I have referred, we are, however, told that classification is protection, while on the other hand the West Indian colonist says: "No; classification is not, but uniformity is protection." Well according to the old proverb, "Give

140 a dog a bad name," it is, I confess, somewhat satisfactory to find that you have nothing to do but to fasten on any doctrine the name of "protection," in order to demonstrate to any reasonable man that you have brought against a particular proposal the worst and most conclusive charge to which it is open. ("Hear, 145 hear," and a laugh.)

ANALOGY OF THE TEA DUTIES.

But there is another argument against classification drawn from the analogy of our tariff, and the mode in which we deal with other articles. It is said, "You never dream of imposing

do so in the case of sugar?" The fact, however, is, that we did impose different duties on teas of different qualities, and that we abandoned that system, not because it was false in point of principle, but because, from the nature of the commodity itself, the 155 principle was found inapplicable in practice.

But is it true that uniformity is the general characteristic of our tariff? That tariff, I am happy to say, now reaches such moderate dimensions that it is not easy to produce instances of the soundness or unsoundness of the view taken upon the one 160 side or the other on this point. The instances, however few, are nevertheless almost all in favour of classification.

ANALOGY OF THE WINE DUTIES.

The winc duty is a rude and partial and very far from being a consistent approximation—but still in a degree it is an approximation—to a duty on value; for there can be no doubt that upon the whole the light wines are much cheaper than the stronger.

COFFEE.

Take the case of coffee; when it comes here in its raw state it pays a duty of 3d. per lb.; when roasted the duty is 4d., and this 170 instance is particularly applicable to the case of sugar, on which if you impose a greater duty in its more manufactured state you are accused by some of being guilty of the high crime and misdemeanour of protection.

COCOA.

175 Again, what do we do with respect to cocoa? When the pure