

Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have also spoken of the increase of revenue, but this increase of revenue must have been brought about by what prominent Liberals used once on a time to call taxes. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has told us that taxation is an evil which nothing but the requirements of government can justify, but to-day we have more revenue than the strictest requirements of government justify. They tell us that the surplus is \$15,000,000, and surely this has not been brought about by a tariff imposed simply for the purpose of raising a revenue. Why does not the Minister of Trade and Commerce abolish this evil now? Let me tell him that in 1896, according to the government books, the taxation amounted to \$3.94 per head of the population. And, although the Liberals of the day told us that this taxation was too onerous, the fact remains that in this year of grace 1903, the taxation is \$6.76 per head of the population, or more than twice what it was in 1896. We were told by the two gentlemen who have addressed the House from the other side, that the tariff is as perfect as it possibly can be under the circumstances in which the country is placed. I was surprised to hear this from the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) because he knows very well that whatever may be the opinion in other parts of the country, the constituency whence he comes does not consider the tariff perfect. Let me tell him, that if his majority in the recent election was reduced from 636 (the majority of the previous Liberal member) to 236, that reduction was due to the fact that the manufacturers and the workmen of Hochelaga are not satisfied with the tariff. If the tariff is perfect, how is it that we have the Minister of Marine (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) and the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) going down to Quebec and saying that necessary changes are going to be made in the tariff. If the tariff is perfect, how is it that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries during the Maisonneuve election posed as a protectionist, willing to give protection to all the legitimate industries of the country; although it is true that at the very same time the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) and the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) were in Argenteuil preaching the doctrine of free trade. Do not we know that for the last three or four sessions, deputation after deputation composed of both Liberals and Conservatives have waited on the government, asking that the tariff be increased? Is it not a fact that in this very House, we saw last session man after man rising from the Liberal benches, and warning the government that if the tariff be not increased on various articles, the doom of the government is sealed?

Sir, is it not a fact that certain industries in this country have gone to the wall because the government have refused to

raise the tariff? Is it not a fact that the manufacture of barbed wire in Canada has ceased because they took the duty off that article, with the only consequence that we pay more for it to-day than we did in 1896? Is it not a fact that the taking of the duty off binder twine has only had the effect of increasing the cost of the article to the consumer? Our hon. friends last session sought to remedy the evil to a certain extent by giving a bounty to the binder twine industry. And what has become of the steel industry? If this industry is suffering to-day, is it not admitted that it is due to the condition of the tariff? If hon. gentlemen opposite had listened to the wise counsels of those who told them that by raising the duty they would establish this great industry in Canada, we should probably have had to-day at Sydney and at Sault Ste. Marie thriving industries affording labour and good wages to a vast number of our fellow-citizens. What has taken place in the cotton industry? In the very constituency from which my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) comes, shortly before his election, a meeting of the shareholders of the cotton industry there was held, and what was the declaration the directors of that establishment had to make to their shareholders? It was that the profits were so small that they could pay no dividend. If hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of sticking to their doctrinaire free trade principles, had come to the relief of the cotton industry, such a thing could not have happened. My hon. friend from South Larnark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has referred to the woollen industry. In the city of Montreal, the woollen mills, instead of thriving as they did in 1896, are now working only four days a week, while in other parts of the country the woollen industry has completely gone to the wall.

I was surprised at what my right hon. friend had to say with regard to the United States. I remember when he had nothing too good to say of that country. I remember when he used to visit Boston, for instance, and tell the people there that there was no country in the world like the United States of America. And yesterday what does he say? He says it is the home of combines, factions and anarchists, and he taunts us with wishing to make Canada the home of combines, factions and anarchists. What does he found his statement on? He quotes from the Montreal 'Star,' and says that is our policy. Sir, it is no part of the Conservative programme, as the hon. member for Hochelaga said, to adopt a servile imitation of the policy of the United States. What we want is increased protection for our industries—our manufacturers, our labouring classes and our farmers; and my hon. friend knows that this is what the country demands. He knows, from the elections that have just taken place, that this is the