

low, and if placed on the market would realise very little. I am satisfied to-day that if the thing was to be done over again the stockholders would be very shy of making an investment. I do not know that any body is to blame for this, but there is no doubt that it is due to the encouragement given under the National Policy to investments of that character. I believe that any man who chooses to open his eyes and take one honest and earnest look at protection will see that it is dishonest and selfish in principle. I do not mean by this that everybody that advocates it is dishonest or that everybody that profits by it is dishonest; but I believe that it is very difficult to make any one think that a policy is wrong which gives him some advantage over his neighbors. It is the hardest thing in the world to convince a man a law is not good which gives him an advantage over others; but the policy, I contend, is wrong in any case. The best way to judge of this policy is to individualise it, to take it separately and alone, not connected with any other industry. Take, for instance, coal, and imagine for a moment that we have no protective policy. Supposing the representatives from Pictou were to ask this Parliament to enact a law which would give them 50 cents protection on coal. They might make all the arguments in favor of that proposition that they can now; they might give the output of coal, the number of men at work, the large capital it would set afloat, the great good it would do the farmers of Nova Scotia by giving them a home market for their produce. All these arguments, under these circumstances, would be just as proper as under other circumstances. Let them then submit a proposition to this House to put a duty on coal; what would be the result? The two gentlemen from Cape Breton, where the coal deposit is, would stand alone on that proposition. Other members would fail to see that it was in the interest of their constituents to put a duty on coal for the purpose of enriching the people of the coal mines in Pictou county. They would say it would be robbing our people, we cannot afford to give you a protection of 50 cents on coal and make it dear for every other industry and every other person who uses coal in the Dominion. People would think it was robbery if only the coal duty was proposed; but you go to the flour men, and the flour men and the coal men come into Parliament together and propose a duty on flour and coal. The flour and coal men would then stand alone. Other hon. members would say again: We cannot afford to protect flour and coal, because that would be robbery; that would be making dear bread and fuel to all the people of the country; we could never do that—and there would only be the coal men and the flour men to vote for it. But you go on and get the cotton and the woollen manufacturers, and the iron manufacturers, and a host of other manufacturers, and you get them all to put their heads together and carry the whole thing. That which was robbery when you proposed the coal duty separately has become quite a different thing now; that which was robbery when you proposed a duty on flour, and thus proposed to make dear bread for the people, becomes quite a different thing. You have to put this thing in its naked deformity; you have to show it up in all its hideousness, to make the people understand it. Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh; but if Robin Hood had too many highway robbers in his company, if all the population were enlisted, it would be no use to take the trouble of robbing, as there would be no victims. There must be victims, and the moment you have enough robbers you stop. You could not carry on this game for flour and coal alone, because the people would not stand being plundered, but you get all these interests combined—you carry your protective policy. But you must stop at a certain point, for it would not do to protect all; you must have somebody to skin or you will have to go on skinning yourselves, and there is no money in that. That is why you carried protection and continue it; there must be victims in the country whom you must plunder. The

Mr. GILLMOR.

victims are the great classes of farmers, fishermen, lumbermen and laborers. These are the men you have to fleece, because your protection is of no use if you have not victims. You must have victims, and therefore when you have enough spoils to be able to divide up something, you stop and do not go further. Hon. gentlemen opposite may pretend to laugh, but they don't feel like laughing all the same. When you get all these in, is it any less robbery? Is it any less unjust than it was when the coal men first came and asked protection? Does that alter the case? It only increases the evil, separately none of you would vote for a duty on coal. Why would you not vote for protection on coal if there was no protection on any of these? I see the member for Perth laughing. Why would you not? I wait for an answer. Why would you not? You would help the men in Pictou, and you would help the members for Pictou to be popular and get elected, and you would help it to make a market for the produce of the farm, and all that. And why would you not do it? You would not dare do it, because it would be unjust to your constituents to do that for the benefit of the coal men.

Mr. HESSON. Correct.

Mr. GILLMOR. Correct; yes. Is it any less unjust because you get more in? No; but there are more of you to divide the spoils and more to help on the system, which is legalised robbery—that is my opinion of it. No; this protective system will not work without victims. Somebody has to suffer under protection—no doubt about it. I find on my notes here a reference to the hon. the Minister of Marine. It is not my purpose, I never wish to criticise gentlemen's speeches—I try to make the best I can out of my own material—but I was surprised at the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It carried my mind back twenty years. I remember, when the question of Confederation was being discussed in the Lower Provinces, I was opposed to that measure, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was of the same opinion; he was opposed to Confederation. I remember having received a speech from the hon. member—I do not know whether he sent it, or somebody else—but it was a speech made by Mr. McLelan, of the Nova Scotia Legislature, and that speech I read with a great deal of satisfaction. It was witty and able, and I derived a great deal of pleasure from reading it, and it afforded me a good many valuable arguments and strong arguments in opposition to Confederation. When I noticed by the press that that hon. gentleman was elected to the first Parliament in Canada, I wished him success, and I felt that if anything would induce me to offer, it would be to be in Parliament with a gentleman with whose views I could coincide and that I endorsed so fully, and I really wished him success and wished I could be here to act in concert with him. Of course, the battle had been fought and we had failed; but I never heard that there was any change in his opinion, I never heard that he had changed his views in regard to that, and you will not be surprised that I was astonished to hear the speech I heard from him the other night. The speech I heard from him the other night was just the kind I had to meet from those who were in favor of Confederation. I remember one opponent of mine who was continually talking about a railway starting from Nova Scotia in a gold field, and passing up through Quebec, and through the wheat fields of Ontario, and out over the broad prairies, and landing in a gold field in British Columbia; and that was the beginning of his speech, and that was the end of his speech. We had to meet just such hifalutin', extravagant speeches all over the Province of New Brunswick, and my hon. friend's speech the other night, when he talked about the iron band which was about to cement the Union, reminded me very much of the speech of the person to whom I allude. I do not believe there is any more feeling in