

When, therefore, our opponents characterise our policy as being an obsolete, ignorant and barbarous one, they are laying themselves open to self-condemnation for they have been legislating in that direction ever since they took office. Some light as to the future policy of the Government has been given in a portion of the speech of the hon. the Finance Minister, to which I will now refer :—

The Finance Minister Characterizes Incidental Protection as "Legalized Robbery."

The Finance Minister explained the mode by which revenue should be raised for the public service in terms which are clear and unmistakeable. He said that taxation, however disguised, is a loss *per se*; that it is the duty of the Government to take only from the people what is necessary to the proper discharge of the public service; and that *taxation in any other mode*, is simply, in one shape or other, "legalized robbery." The proposition was clearly stated, and of course has a distinct and definite meaning. That meaning is, that duties should invariably be imposed for revenue alone; that no other consideration than the bare question of revenue should determine the mode of raising revenue; that whenever a customs duty is in the slightest degree protective, and by reason of the protection it gave, takes from the people indirectly any money which does not go into the Treasury, it is to that extent "legalized robbery." In vindication of this position, *which subverts the whole system of incidental protection*, he declares that he and his associates are willing "to fight to the death." The views of the Hon. the Finance Minister are laid down in an eminent free trade work, no less an authority, indeed, than John Stuart Mill, who expressed the following opinions, which, no doubt, would be listened to with gratification by gentlemen who entertain his views :

"In countries in which the Protection theory is declining, but not yet given up, such as the United States, a doctrine has come into notice which is a sort of compromise between free trade and restriction, namely, that protection for protection's sake is improper, but that there is nothing objectionable in having as much protection as may incidentally result from a tariff framed solely for revenue. Even in England, regret is sometimes expressed that a "moderate fixed duty" was not preserved on corn, on account of the revenue it would yield. Independently, however, of the general implicity of taxes on the necessities of life, this doctrine overlooks the fact, that revenue is received only on the quantity imported, but that the tax is paid on the entire quantity consumed. To make the public pay much that the Treasury may receive a little, is not an eligible mode of obtaining a revenue. In the case of manufactured articles the doctrine involves a practical inconsistency. The object of the duty as a means of revenue, is inconsistent with its affording, even incidentally, any protection. It can only operate as protection in so far as it prevents importation; and to whatever degree it prevents importation, it affords no revenue."

From their manifestations of assent, I understand that both the Finance Minister and the Hon. Minister of the Interior accept the foregoing extract from Mill's Political Economy as explanation of the position for which they are willing "to fight to the death."

Mr. Cartwright endorses Stuart Mill's mode of Raising Revenue.

Now if they took a high authority to assist them in making a diagnosis, Ministers should have confidence in the same authority

wit
from

they
in th
is th

imp
mus
man
exci
sam
dile
I t
coul
exci
thus
ing
000
are
Tho
but
disp
man
wou
Wou
reve
\$35,
he in
the f
man
duce
facti
tunit
whic
tectio
the
the T
it wi
my h
ously
such
woul
adop
insur
must
electi
say in