

AN  
OPEN LETTER

FROM

MR. C. C. COLBY, M. P.

MR. C. H. MACKINTOSH,

*Editor Ottawa Citizen :—*

*My Dear Sir,*—Believe me, I appreciate your kind and complimentary letter, more particularly as I fully estimate the efforts your journal has put forth in advocacy of a National Fiscal Policy. The speech upon Tariff Revision, lately delivered by me, in the House of Commons, you are quite at liberty to use in any way you deem proper. Had I anticipated the extensive publication you propose giving it, I should have arranged it with greater care. You will recollect, I entered the field of debate as a tardy gleaner, having little reason to expect that I would be able to gather even a respectable sheaf.

As the Tariff question must exercise a large influence at the coming election, I think it important that there should be an accurate definition of respective party beliefs. No one of the Conservative party having dissented from any exposition of its platform, and the Finance Minister and the Hon. Mr. Mills having manifested their assent, as, step, by step, I laid down what I understood to be the Ministerial planks, the country may, I think, accept my definition as substantially correct. I endeavored to prove that the declaration of Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, "that if a particular trade or industry were to be protected it could only be done at the expense of some other trade or industry" is historically, and in fact, untrue. The above declaration is the major premises of the Free Trade arguments, as applied in Canada. If it fails, the superstructure must fall.

I endeavored to show that the carefully stated announcement by the Finance Minister, in his Budget speech, of the mode of taxation, in vindication of which he and his associates are "prepared to fight to the death" is, when analysed, a pointed and emphatic declaration that even the mildest form of Incidental Protection is "legalised robbery." Neither the Finance Minister, the Hon. Mr. Mills nor any other member of the