

brooms and brushes, carriages and horses, patent medicines, chemical dies and medicines, cotton goods, fish, canned salmon, cordage, canned fruits, explosives, india-rubber boots and shoes; india-rubber, manufactures of; iron castings; machinery, nails, saws and tools, scales and balances, sewing machines, engines, stationary; boilers and parts, stoves, ranges, &c., wire, all other manufactures of iron, leather, boots and shoes, harness and saddles; other manufactures of leather; oil and cement, malt liquors, slate roofing, stone, manufactures of; musical instruments, organs, pianos; oil, whale and fish, kerosene, lubricating; paints and painters' colours; paper, printing and wrapping; plated wire, soap, toilet and common; tobacco, cigars, vegetables, canned; timber, manufactures of. These are the articles which the United States have been sending to Australia. Why should not the manufacturers of this country compete with them?

Now, Sir, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has given away the whole principle of protection. I ask you, Sir, and I ask the people of the country, if Canada can compete in the open and neutral markets of the world with England and the United States, in those articles here mentioned, why should the consumers of this country be burdened by a high tariff to protect them in their own country? If the manufacturers of this country can make those articles and send them six thousand miles across the sea, paying the freight, paying the agencies, paying insurance, and paying everything that is involved in sending those articles into a foreign country, and then go into the open market in competition with English cottons and English machinery, with United States cottons and United States machinery, with Canadian cottons and cottons from other countries—I ask you why it is that nine out of every ten of the people of this country should be burdened with these high duties in order to prevent these parties from having competition in the country of which they are citizens? I challenge any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to answer that question satisfactorily to himself or satisfactorily to any reasonable man in this country. But according to the Speech from the Throne we are to have the principle of protection continued; we are to have the policy of the last fifteen years continued as a burden upon the people yet. Let me read to the House the paragraph of the Address which refers to this subject and to the continuance of the policy of protection. It is as follows:—

At an early date a measure will be laid before you having for its object a revision of the Duties of Customs with a view to meet the changes which time has effected in business operations of all kinds throughout the Dominion. While my Ministers do not propose to change the principles on which the existing enactments on this subject are based the amendments which will be offered for your consideration are designed to simplify the operation of the tariff and to lessen, as far as can be done, consistently with those principles and with the requirements of the Treasury, the imposts which are now in force.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, there are two conditions on which this tariff revision is to be made: the first is, that care must be exercised not to touch the manufacturers and to preserve the principle of protection, and the next is, to be very careful to have sufficient revenue for the next election, not to affect the treasury of the country. Not one word is said about the interests of the consumers who have been burdened by this tariff during the last fifteen years, not one word is said about the labouring classes; tariff revision is not to be consistent with their well-being but with the principle of protection on the one hand and with having enough money in the public treasury on the other. The Government will disappoint the expectations of the people when it is seen that the object of this reduction, amendment or readjustment, if you may call it so, is to be carried out solely and entirely in the interests of the treasury, so as to have money to spend lavishly, and to furnish the same protection to the manufacturers as they have been receiving for the last fifteen years. One of the most eminent statesmen in the world, a man who has attained the extraordinary age of eighty-four years, has stated that protection is a system of legal robbery, and not one whit the more respectable because the state is the culprit. This system which has been in force for the last fifteen years has burdened nine-tenths of the people and acted as legalized robbery as regards their interests in order to place a proportion of their earnings in the hands of the favoured few who constitute one-tenth of the population of the country. You know very well, Mr. Speaker, the origin of the word "tariff." It came from *Tariffa*, the name of a great sea robber residing on the northern part of Africa on the shores of the Mediterranean, who built a city and a castle for himself, and who when the merchant ships came from the east towards the west raided and robbed them of a portion of their goods. But the merchants having been despoiled of a portion of their goods placed an additional price on the balance and made the consumers pay it. Is not that the principle of the tariff to-day? Does not the tariff levy one-third or one-fourth of the whole value, and is not an additional price placed on the balance sold to the consumers, the manufacturers and merchants thus recouping themselves from the pockets of the consumers? Very truly can it be said that the tariff is a robbery of the many for the benefit of the few. But, again, protection is a promise to shelter the manufacturers. What does the Government say to the manufacturer? It says, you go on and manufacture your goods. It is true you cannot manufacture them as cheaply as manufacturers in England, Germany and other countries. True, your skill may not be so great and your machinery not so perfect, and there may be a waste of capital; but we will see that the waste which takes place is counter-balanced by keeping you from the competition of