I hope not, but I fear that such will be the case.

About buggies, carriages, pleasure-carts. and the like of that: there is an article of manufacture which has to-day in this country a hard struggle to maintain itself against American competition; and it has found it impossible successfully to maintain itself against that competition without the imposition of specific duties on the low-priced That specific duty has been cut article. off; and with simply the ad valorem duty on I must express the fear that the business of carriage, buggy and pleasure-cart making in this country, so far as honest making is concerned, is a thing of the past, and that what will be done hereafter will be the assembling of parts or the importation of the made article.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Bicycles.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon, friend has something the matter with him. I do not know what. I would take it very kindly, Speaker, if you would try to find out. The same remark applies to carpets, although the duty on yarns has been reduced, which may mitigate the reduction on carpets to a certain extent. A similar remark applies to confectionery, a large interest in this country. Thirty-five per cent was sufficient protection for the confectionery business when sugar was free; but when half a cent a pound is put on sugar, and only the ad valorem duty is kept on confectionery, and what applied as a specific duty upon it to counterbalance the rise in the duty on the raw material is taken off, I fear that that industry will fall a prey to the confection-

ery industries of others than Canadians.

The manufacture of shirts, collars, and cuffs forms an industry in this country which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) may smile at; but I can take him down to the French constituencies in and around Montreal, and I can show him one of the most widely spread home industries you will find in Canada, which is to-day distributed amongst hundreds and thousands of habitants' houses where the women add to the daily fare and the keep of their homes by working on these articles at a moderate rate. I say that with simply an ad valorem duty that business goes to Troy or to Germany and Belgium, or to England. This may be a small thing, but it is the multiplicity of these small industries which constitute the comfort and well-being of the masses of the people; and if we are to keep a protective tariff at all, no man in this country feels the impost added to the cost of his shirts and collars and the like of that, compared at all with the derangement and destruction of an industry which goes into the homes of hundreds and thousands of people in the rural districts around the cities and villages of this coun-

I might go on particularizing, but I simply make these statements with regard to these few things. But when the duties on these are being reduced. when out of these homes the means of livelihood have been taken. when the hundreds of small woollen mills are put to it in the fight with merciless competition, with small vantage ground, what excuses the keeping of 60 cents a ton on coal, which the Toronto "Globe," relying on the word of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), relying on the pledged word of the Minister who leads this Government, declared should as a raw material come in free? What can be said to these other maimed and maybe destroyed industries, when this great industry, which Mr. Hardy, in the presence of the Prime Minister on the platform in Brantford, declared was run by a New York or Boston syndicate, is left untouched? Did we expect that the coal duties would be taken off? Yes, and why? Because we had faith in the pledged word of the Prime Minister of to-day, the leader of the party, who a few months ago said:

We are told we must not destroy the manufactories of Montreal. I say we are not going to destroy the industries of Montreal.

I contend, on the contrary, that an application of the ideas of the hon. Minister of Finance will inaugurate an era of prosperity such as Montreal has not seen since the inauguration of the National Policy. The present system raises the maximum of taxation, not only on the consumer, but also on the producer. They have a tax on iron, which is also the raw material of every industry, and a tax on coal, which is also a raw material of every industry, of 60 cents a ton; and, although I have not the latest quotations in coal, I am afraid that this tax is equivalent to 40 per cent. Now, I am asked, What are you going to do? I have just told you. We are going to have a tariff for revenue and to abolish the duties on raw materials. I say that, if we were to have a revenue tariff, raw materials would be free. Raw materials are not free to-day under the protective system. There are certain raw materials which are free. Wool is free; thank heaven, they have not thought of taxing it, and cotton is free also. But iron is not free, nor is coal; and while cotton and wool are the raw materials of some industries, coal and iron are the raw materials of them all. If you have a revenue tariff, these will be free.

Had not Mr. Hardy a good right to expect, when he promised free coal to the people of Brantford, that his promise would be implemented? But the hon. First Minister had an able coadjutor, who sits beside him to-night in the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who has been looked upon as the strong man of the Cabinet, and he declared standing in this House:

Now, if there be a principle of political economy clearer than another, it is the principle that the worst tax which could be imposed is a tax on a necessary of life like coal. Moreover, it is a tax exceedingly partial and unjust in its effects. It is one which will fall specially on the poorer-