

back to this country they raise the price to the consumers of Canada, who are thus forced to recoup them for their loss or their small profit. Let me give you an instance of this. The cotton companies of this country found last year, or the year before, that the markets were glutted. They could not sell their products with a high profit because there was too much in the market, and so they concluded that something else must be done. They sent \$245,000 worth of cotton to China, and sold it in the Chinese markets in competition with the German, the Indian, the English and other cottons. Now, if they realized a sufficient living profit they do not want protection, and if they did not receive a living profit they could not afford to export it in this way. What did they do? Immediately after unloading on the Chinese market they came back to Canada and raised the price of cotton 15 per cent to the Canadian consumers. In this way the Canadian consumers not only paid the legitimate profits upon the cottons they were using, but they were made to pay as well to the cotton manufacturers the loss they sustained, or the lesser profit they obtained, by sending the goods across the sea and competing with the producers in other lands. There was a base iniquity perpetrated on the consumers of this country, and the country to-day will be very sorry to hear from the Address from the Throne that that system of iniquity is to be continued. But, Mr. Speaker, protection has another fault. Protection renders non-productive millions of the capital of Canada which might be used in other ways. Let me explain this. In the work of distributing the products of this country there are millions of capital invested. It is estimated that there are about three hundred millions worth of manufactured articles distributed to consumers through the various markets of this country. Supposing that one man undertook the business of distribution, he would require a capital of \$300,000,000, in addition to what he would require to work his business. Under free trade, he would only require \$210,000,000, or 30 per cent less to do the same work, employ the same hands to distribute the same articles, and here we would save ninety millions of money that might be invested in other industries of the country, which would give employment to about ninety thousand men. Let me give you another illustration of the loss of capital in distribution under this high tariff. We will take the article of iron. We import, in round numbers, about ten million dollars worth of iron each year, and on that we pay \$3,000,000 duty. If there were no duty, a man could undertake to distribute the whole iron used by the various consumers of this country for \$10,000,000. That would be the amount of capital he would have to put in his business, but, under the present condition he pays \$13,000,000. There are three millions more which are lost and unproductive. He does not employ more

hands by the expenditure of the thirteen millions, because he has to send it out to the same consumers, but if he invested in other manufactures that three millions which he could spare out of his distribution business, it would give employment to thirty thousand men. As another instance, take the importation of coal oil. We imported last year 5,600,000 gallons for the various consumers of Canada, and the distribution of that will employ a certain number of hands. Under the tariff, we have got to pay \$437,000 for the oil and \$430,000 duty, which comes to nearly \$900,000 altogether, which a man engaged in that business would require to distribute that amount of oil under the present conditions. But suppose we had free trade. \$437,000 would buy the oil; he would require the same number of hands to distribute the 5,600,000 gallons, he would give employment to just as many people, and have \$430,000 of his capital to invest in and develop the country in various ways. So you see, that the protective tariff is a waste of millions and millions of capital (as I have said already, nearly \$90,000,000) in the entire distribution of the country. But, Mr. Speaker, protection has another fault. Protection protects the rich and discriminates against the poor. I am prepared to prove from our own official documents that it discriminates against the poor man and favours the rich man, and I challenge any hon. gentleman upon the opposite side of the House to prove anything else, for the figures here are incontrovertible. The arguments are of such a character that they cannot be gainsaid; for, Sir, when I place before you these facts, and ask you to consider them in that light, no other conclusion can be arrived at. On the imports last year the average tariff was 30 per cent. Here are some of the tariffs paid by the farmers of Canada: mowers, reapers, ploughs, drills, 35 per cent, 5 per cent above the average. Forks (two and three-pronged), 50 per cent, 20 per cent above the average tariff. Forks (four and five and six-pronged), 46 per cent, 16 per cent above the average. Hoes, 48 per cent, 18 per cent above the average. Garden rakes, 49 per cent, 19 per cent above the average. Barbed fence wire, 54 per cent, 24 per cent above the average. Now, look at another schedule of duties which will show how the poor man is discriminated against. On checked shirting, the cheapest in the market, the duty is 48 per cent, on the dearest 22½ per cent; on gray cottons, the cheapest, 36 per cent, the dearest, 21¼ per cent; on flannels, all-wool, the cheapest, 40 per cent, the dearest, 25¼ per cent; on tweeds, the cheapest, 42 per cent, the dearest, 26 per cent; on beaver overcoatings, the cheapest, 80 per cent, the dearest, 30 per cent; on nap overcoatings, the cheapest, 75 per cent, the dearest, 33 per cent; on serge cloakings, the cheapest, 58 per cent, the dearest, 33 per cent; on blankets, the cheapest, 130 per cent, the dearest, 33 per cent. On only three of these