

customs, and with the next that, as the duties were not prohibitory, it was a protective tariff that would not protect.

And whilst the revenue has largely increased, and the former deficits have been changed into surpluses, we have seen a great impetus given to manufactures of various kinds. Nor have the prices to the consumer, except in certain lines, increased so largely as to give rise to any considerable discontent. So that Mr. Cartwright, when he thinks of these facts, must say within himself, 'All these things are against me. Until hard times come again, I shall have no chance of getting the people to listen to me.'

What a position for a politician or a statesman to be placed in!

It could have been nothing else but the attitude of the Reformers on this tariff question, for the last three years, and at the present time, that saved the Government and the Syndicate during the recent Session of Parliament.

There can be no doubt, I think, that the great majority of the people, and probably a majority of their representatives in Parliament, really disapproved of the terms of the Contract, especially after the proposal of the Howland Syndicate; and under other circumstances, they would never have supported Sir John as they did. But they reasoned in this way—Sir John is committed to this Contract, he must stand or fall by it, if we turn him out, the Grits must come in, and then they will reverse the National Policy, and turn the affairs of the country upside down.

This was the true reason why so many Conservative members were prepared to vote for so monstrous a sacrifice of the interests of their country, and why they braved the indignation of the people as they did.

And they may make use of the same argument when the next contest before the people comes on. The people will be disposed to condemn the conduct of the present Govern-

ment in forcing through the contract with the St. Paul Syndicate. Beyond all doubt, they will. But the Tories will say, 'If you put us out the Grits will come in, and where will your protection be? Are they not pledged to reverse the National Policy at the first opportunity? And will you allow your manufacturing industries to be crushed; the Pacific Railway to be abandoned, or indefinitely postponed, and everything to be put into confusion merely for the sake of punishing us for what is past and for what cannot be undone?'

To such an appeal there can only be one response, and therefore I say that, to my mind, it is perfectly clear that, unless the Liberal party changes its platform on the tariff question very considerably, it will be beaten at the next election.

Those who have followed me thus far, may ask what changes I would suggest in the platform of the Liberal party on this question. The changes I have to suggest are all founded upon this, that the true fiscal policy for Canada is—a REVENUE TARIFF, so adjusted as to give INCIDENTAL PROTECTION.

A certain large sum must be raised every year from the customs and excise duties, for no one seriously urges the imposition of direct taxation. Certain articles of general consumption can be advantageously produced in the country and certain others cannot.

Suppose we were a purely agricultural people, and had no manufactures whatever, but imported everything that we used except the actual produce of the field, forest and stream. If such were our condition, we might as well pay our taxes on one class of imports as another. Some things must be rendered dearer to the consumers in order that a revenue may be raised. Well then, would it be economical folly for a Finance Minister to lay the highest taxes on such imported articles that a few simple manufactures would be encouraged into life? I