

unable to arrive at any decision from the statements and arguments I have heard. We have been told that the Government were induced, by the threats of Lower Province members, to adhere to their policy, or rather to change it, because I am led to believe their original intention was to bring in a just and reasonable tariff. Now, I should like to know what men from the Lower Provinces did that. I never was invited by members from New Brunswick to attend any meeting to discuss the question.

We have heard the Premier talk about rings resulting from protection, but are there no rings in Canada? Have we not heard of them here where we have no protection?

I think the present depression is nothing new, following, as it does, a period of prosperity; but that is no reason why we should not adopt a policy to meet the occasion. I do not believe any man who is sound on the question of political economy believes in a high protective tariff, but I believe in incidental protection which will help our manufacturers for the moment and prevent their being slaughtered by the introduction of cheap goods from the neighbouring country. We are told that a protective tariff would make goods dear. I do not believe it, and in proof of it I point to the United States where iron is cheaper than it can be procured in Great Britain. Coal can be sold at the pits-mouth as cheap or cheaper than in England, and even cotton and other manufactured goods are exported to the Mother Country. If a protective tariff ranging from 40 to 60 per cent. *ad valorem* does not enhance the cost of goods there, why should a moderate tariff increase the price of wares here?

To my mind the cure for high prices is this: A high protective tariff stimulates industries and causes over-production. But do you find over-production here? On the contrary the country is crying out for protection to enable our manufacturers to produce more. We find in Nova Scotia the coal, iron and limestone almost together, and labour not much dearer than in Great Britain. Iron could be produced there to compete with the world. Instead of depending upon England for our

iron we should be able to export it to Australia, the East Indies and South America.

The United States manufacturers have a home market, and send their surplus productions to other countries, even though they cannot realize a profit. That is the way they regulate the supply and prevent the home market from being over-stocked.

I should like to see such a tariff adopted as would enable Nova Scotia to produce 200,000 tons of iron and steel a year. That would necessitate the consumption of 400,000 tons of coal, and the employment of a large number of men. Allowing \$25 per ton as the cost of production, that would give an annual expenditure of \$5,000,000 in the Province, that now goes abroad to pay for foreign labour. Ontario would supply the flour, but although the people of the Lower Provinces complain, it would be levying a tax of \$300,000 a year on them to protect it they would send back to Ontario pig iron to pay for it. The people of Nova Scotia are mistaken if they think protection would do them any harm. If any Province would have a right to complain it would be Ontario.

What we want in this country is such a tariff as will enable us all to get along. The Government, no doubt, think they are doing the best in the interests of the whole country; but there are many industries that require protection, and it is the duty of this Parliament to legislate for the benefit of all classes of the community.

I believe in free-trade if we can get it, but our shipping is deprived of the coasting trade of the United States, while their vessels trade in our waters. Now, I say that is not free-trade. Let them open their markets to us and we will be happy to trade with them on equal terms. I heard the hon. member from Carlton say that he believed in free-trade—that he did not believe in taxing special industries—and at the same time he enunciated the doctrine that the stamp duties should be done away with.

Mr. SPEAKER—That was in another debate. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. DOMVILLE—I will say, then,