

When you look over the list of articles I have read and compared the tariff collected during Mr. Mackenzie's regime with the tariff now imposed, and take into consideration the fact that the expenditure of the country is about one-third more, I think that the tariff of the present Finance Minister bears a very close resemblance to that which was in existence when Mr. Mackenzie was in office. So that when hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is protection from top to bottom, I consider this a very strong answer to that charge.

It is said that the Reform party promised that its policy would be death to protection. Well, Mr. Speaker, we intend to carry out that policy so far as the monopolies of this country are concerned. Monopolies will be absolutely forbidden to exist under the regime of the present Government. We do not want, by the simple passage of a law, to permit a certain number of favoured individuals to draw heavily on the resources of the people and put money into their own pockets. We are willing that any home industry should have what advantages a revenue tariff will afford it, but those specific duties, levied for the purpose of enabling favoured individuals to manufacture their commodities and draw from the people excessive taxes, are repealed, and such advantages are being rapidly brought to a close. It was not desirable, in the interests of the people, that such a condition of things should continue. A revenue tariff is the only sound tariff. When we had a protective tariff, our Finance Minister was entirely at the mercy of those who were ready with arguments in the interests of the different institutions they represented. I should like to know in what position the ex-Finance Minister found himself when parties came to him to urge increased taxation. I should like to know how possibly the ex-Finance Minister, when parties came to him asking for increased taxation, could judge whether what they were asking was reasonable or excessive. He could not possibly know anything about it. It would require an expert in the business of every party seeking protection to decide whether the increased protection sought for was too large or the reverse. And if the Finance Minister was not an expert, he could not possibly be in a position to decide that important point himself. Therefore I contend that a revenue tariff is the only safe, sound and honest means of levying a customs tax in any country. The moment you depart from that, the moment you open your ear to the remonstrances and persistent demands and importunities of the men who advocate increased taxation in their own interests, that moment you run the serious risk of imposing an enormously increased taxation on the people, not for the people's good, but for the benefit of those who are interested in securing an advance in the tariff. A revenue tariff is the only safe, prudent and honest system.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Levying taxes in Her Majesty's name and not for Her Majesty's purposes is a dishonest method of taxation, to which the people should not be asked to submit. The difference between the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite and the tariff we have now in force is simply this. They made protection the leading feature of their policy. To protect every institution was their first object, and the question whether the tax imposed was sufficient to meet the demands on the Dominion treasury or not was only a secondary consideration. We have reversed that order. The tariff now levied is levied from the standpoint of honestly collecting the sum necessary to meet the demands on the Dominion treasury, and any institution that can get any little incidental advantage out of a tariff of that kind is quite welcome to it. But we deny that it is proper to tax the people because some institutions want to benefit thereby.

The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) last night gave us a little exhibition in the style of Mark Twain. The hon. gentleman seems to occupy a somewhat similar position in this House to that filled by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). The latter hon. gentleman occasionally affords us considerable amusement, but I must say that the returning officer who gave that one casting vote which put the hon. gentleman in his seat, who has wasted so much of our time, has a great deal to answer for. The hon. member for Toronto is evidently training to take the place of the hon. member for Assiniboia and he gave us some little amusement last night. He said that we had stolen the clothes of the Conservative party. I deny that, Mr. Speaker. We never at any time wanted to clothe ourselves in the filthy rags of protection. We have always opposed the system, and we intend to oppose it, on principle, to the end.

Now, the hon. ex-Finance Minister said that the Slogan cry was "Death to Protection." If he will just alter that to "Death to monopoly," we will admit the truth of the statement. We intend to do away with monopolies; and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot but admit that monopolies do exist in this country. I believe that the Reform party will carry out every pledge they have made. But it is impossible to do all in one session of Parliament. I think the step they have already taken in the direction of relieving the people of excessive taxation and of reforming the tariff is a guarantee that from time to time, as necessity arises, further steps will be taken and the tariff so revised as to reduce the prices of commodities which the people require. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite declare themselves apprehensive of the effect of the new tariff upon the country, and claim that it was a mistake on the part of the people to change from the policy which has been in existence for the last eighteen years. When we