

declares: That it is quite sufficient if he will just disown the theory,—never mind the practice. And, Lord Farrer was lifted to the seventh heaven, because he had private information that the Liberals of Canada had got so far that they had disowned the theory of protection, but the practice of protection they intended to sustain.

Having buoyed himself up on these two erudite and far-distant authorities, he came to his own reasons. He argued that the National Policy men had no vested rights—"The Liberal-Conservatives say they have, but we say they have not, and we have a perfect right to shut down on them here and now, and they have no right to say a word against it." He made the astonishing assertion that the trade of this country, based on parliamentary enactment, was simply speculation and gambling, and that if the people of this country, constitutionally governed as it is, issue their fiat, and through the Government of the day, enact it into law, no more attention is to be paid to their action than you would pay to the throw of a gambler's dice. The National Policy man, he says, goes into the business as a gambler; if he wins, the gain is his; if he loses, let him pay up and look pleasant. I hope, Sir, that doctrine will never mark the statesmanship of this country. I hope that whenever this Parliament of Canada lays down a basis of action, and invites capital and labour to go in on that basis and build up their industries, and in the course of time a change of opinion comes, it will never even be argued that the Government of that time is not to take account of what the view of the commonwealth was at a preceding time. I hope my hon. friend will not persist in that doctrine. It is a doctrine which, as applied to this case, cannot be sustained by argument or by reason, and will not be sustained by the country.

Then he puts in a plea for keen competition. He said that manufacturers ought to have keen competition; they were lazy in their methods, behind the time, not up to date, and it would be well to let in the keen air of free trade competition. Then, my hon. free trade friend began to look pleasant, and said to himself, "It is coming our way this time; they are really going to carry out their pledges." But there came another turn. The hon. gentleman invoked the platform of 1893, reading it in a Delphic double sense, so that in one sense it was principle or death, and in the other it was expediency and life. And so, proceeding and ringing the changes on it as he did, when he got through I noticed that the face of my hon. free trade friend was a perfect brown study—he did not know on which end he was standing. At last, after all this going in and coming out, all this strong and conclusive argument, and all this fulmination as to the wickedness and the wrong of the protective tariff, it came out that what the hon. gentleman proposed to do

was to adopt, to all intents and purposes, the tariff of the Liberal-Conservative party, which was put on the Statute-book in 1894. How many changes have been made in it? Go through it and read them. Leaving out wines, spirits and tobacco, take the articles in the tariff, item by item; read over and count up those that are changed and those that are unchanged, and you will find that nine-tenths of the tariff remains exactly as we left it in 1894. my hon. friend took nearly two hours of argument yesterday to show was bad in its inception and worse in its action.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### After Recess.

#### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Maritime Milling Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the River St. Clair Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the St. Mary's River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Dymont.)

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 44) An Act respecting the Welland Power and Supply Canal Company (Limited).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. What then is the result, when we come down to absolute action on the part of the Government of the day, as announced to the House through the Finance Minister? There are two results. First, that the Liberal party, headed by my hon. friend, the First Minister, has declared, through its Finance Minister, to this House and the country and the world its deliberate adoption of the principle of protection. It has embalmed that principle in its tariff; and if it has, in some few cases, lightened the duties upon special articles, in other cases it has added to the protection which was upon these articles under the old tariff. Whatever may be said in palliation, or excuse or extenuation, that fact is one which remains from this time forward on the statute-books of the country, that there is to-day in this Parliament, as between the two sides, practically no difference upon the expediency of the principle of protection as the guiding principle of our fiscal system. Not only is their principal and main tariff schedule founded avowedly, founded absolutely on the principle of protection, and comparatively high protection, but the only novel feature which they have about their tariff of to-day, and it is certainly a novel feature, is one which is only possible because of the