

tional Policy, in a country with a population at that time of less than five millions. Now, Sir Richard was accepted at that time all over the Dominion as the greatest authority on trade statistics.

But let us take the next fourteen years, up to 1907, the date of the second Fielding tariff revision. Assuming that Sir Richard was right in his computation as to the first thirteen years, the years between 1893 and 1907 must have robbed this nation of one and a half billion of dollars, because during that time we increased in population by one and a half millions, and the dutiable items had increased from three hundred and forty to four hundred and eighty; besides it was during this period that certain provinces gave substantial aid to the steel industry and many municipalities aided the establishment of certain industries within their own borders.

But I come to another phase of the question. Is the money cost all that is to be considered? What was the moral cost in all those years? The right hon. leader of the Opposition pointed out yesterday the seriousness of a government scrapping its pre-election pledges. Now, in the same speech of Sir Richard Cartwright I gleaned the following:

It must be obvious to everyone who will give the slightest consideration to the working of the protective system in this country or elsewhere that the moment you introduce that system you make legal provision for corruption on a most extensive scale. The moment you introduce the protective system you create a class whose interests are essentially different from those of the people at large, and who become ready contributors to corruption funds, sharing with their masters the plunder they have been enabled to filch from the pockets of the people.

In the House of Commons debates of April 11, 1890, Sir Richard, in answer to a question from the Honourable Mackenzie Bowell, declared:

The whole business of protection is robbery, legalized robbery. You subsidize the manufacturers, and in return the manufacturers subsidize you. The thing is openly done by both parties to the transaction.

In 1891 when he published *Canada and the Canadian people*, Goldwin Smith made exactly the same charge. Who will say to-day that a similar debauchery is not practised when politicians will still defend a system of revenue that places one dollar in the treasury and five in the pockets of the protected interests? Previous to 1896 a system of education in opposition to the National Policy with all that it entailed, was carried on by the Liberal party. They educated the people to the evils of the protective system and the benefits of free trade; but after 1897 this educational effort ceased, and since that time a generation of young Canadians has grown

up which sees nothing better in the public life of this country than was described by Sir Richard Cartwright. I think we need go no further to find what is the matter with this Dominion to-day. This is the state of affairs at the present time, and those on both sides of this House who advocate the maintenance of the present system are doing so in face of the fact that people have been driven out of their very homes from the great basic industry of agriculture, and that our workers are seeking employment in another country.

Now, the member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) put the blame on the farmers themselves for their present unsatisfactory condition and said it was due to their lack of method and industry. He even went so far as to declare that the pioneers of to-day were of the ginger pop kind—all gas and no kick. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are thirty-five of those pioneers in this little group to which I belong, and they are not any of the gassy kind either. Some of us furnished our quota to the brave army that fought for the liberties of this Dominion. Many of us who had begun to take life a little easier resumed active work on the farm in order that our sons might fight the battle of freedom. No, we are not of the gassy kind. We did not try to hide our boys in the woods or in theological seminaries either. And we are not mentally or commercially helpless, as the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) describes those he is pleading for and on whose behalf he exclaims, "Oh, if you don't leave us alone we shall die."

In this debate the advocates of trade penalties have expatiated on the wealth of our natural resources, and at the same time they whine at their helplessness to make use of those resources. And yet they charge us with seeking paternalism from this government. I say, Mr. Speaker, it would be better for this nation if these people depended on their own industrial ability and ceased whining about the stability of the tariff. I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but it does not require much prophetic skill to foresee that there will be no stability in this country until all our people shall enjoy their citizenship in the fullest degree. The phrase has frequently been used in this House, "Canada for the Canadians." Who are the Canadians? Have the agriculturists and workers no part in this Dominion? At last Friday's sitting of this House there was brought forth a plea for the workers at Powell river, British Columbia, and it was found there was no way in which parliament could protect those people from the unjust and unreasonable action of their employers. It is true the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mur-