

Government on the tariff they have brought down. It is not possible for everybody to be satisfied with all the items of the tariff. Very many of us view the tariff from our own particular environment; but the Government must take a higher position and judge what is best for the whole country, for they do not govern for a locality, but for the whole country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Therefore they must take a wide, broad and liberal view of all the industries with which they have to deal. Although I cannot agree with all the items in the tariff, I congratulate the Government upon accomplishing with such success the difficult task they had before them. They have presented to this country a tariff which I believe will be generally accepted by all the industries of this country, and by people outside of the industries, with a degree of favour which has not been accorded to any other tariff since confederation.

Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition at times try to make out that the Liberal party have stolen their clothes. It brings a smile across the face of everybody who knows the history of the two parties to suppose for one moment that the clothes of the Liberal-Conservative party are large enough for the Liberal party of this country, and more particularly so, when they have worn those clothes for the last eighteen years, and now we find them out at the elbows, out at the knees, and out at every other place where you would expect to find them out if you understood the anatomy of the human frame. In fact, the clothes of the Conservative party are made up of shreds and patches; patch after patch has been put on them for eighteen years, until they are speckled and spotted like the animals that Jacob agreed to take from Laban as his share of the herd. And it is absurd to suppose for one moment that we are going to accept garments of such a character, garments across which the electorate of this country wrote on the 23rd of June last, "Mene, mene, tekel upharsin." No, Mr. Speaker, we have garments of our own; they are up-to-date, made after the latest fashion, and they are of the colours, red, white and blue. Upon these garments are buttons which are stamped alternately, the beaver and the maple leaf on one, and the lion and the unicorn on another, and underneath the whole is written "Dieu et mon droit"—my God and my country. Now, that means a great deal. When we say "My God," it means purity with the Liberal party; and when we say "my country," it means patriotism to Canada, for which the Liberal party has long been noted.

Sometimes hon. gentlemen opposite will say we are drifting towards free trade. That was just the way England obtained free trade as she has it to-day. She did not take one big, bold step towards free trade. Free trade went on developing from the year 1842, when the duties on some articles were

reduced, until 1885, when she removed the last vestige of the duty on sugar; and if the Liberal party are retained in power, as I hope they will be, for the next forty years, and if I am living at that time, I may be in a position to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that we have free trade as it is in England.

Then, again, we are told that we are going to destroy the industries of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, do you suppose for one moment that the Liberal party of this country have any desire to destroy the industries of their own friends? A majority of the manufacturing industries of this country are conducted by supporters of the Liberal party, and a majority of the workmen engaged in those industries to-day are Liberals. Therefore, while we require a revenue tariff so high as we do, it will give an incidental protection which, in my opinion, will sustain and support any industry that is adapted to this country. The hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Wallace) said that the Government made a great blunder in increasing the duty on rice, claiming that that was detrimental to the rice users of this country. But, Sir, the plainest calculation, if he had made it, would show that the Government realize about \$59,000 a year for the exchequer by that simple change, without charging the people of this country one solitary cent in addition, but taking this contribution out of the large profits of the manufacturers or cleaners of rice. Let me give you a simple illustration which proves this to a demonstration. Last year we imported into this country 7,249,000 pounds of cleaned rice, invoiced at \$122,000, on which a duty of \$89,614 was paid, making a total cost of \$211,806, which was equal to \$2.92 per hundred pounds. Of uncleaned rice we imported 13,311,000 pounds. Allowing a loss of 20 per cent for cleaning, which is a very large reduction, this represented 10,648,872 pounds of cleaned rice. Now, how much did that rice cost the importers? The invoice price of it was \$108,477, and the duty paid was \$40,538, or a total cost of \$149,015. This made the cost to the cleaners of rice \$1.39 per hundred pounds. Now, the difference between \$1.39 and \$2.92 per hundred is \$1.53 per hundred, which went to the cleaners of rice. Now, if you multiply the 10,648,872 pounds by \$1.53, it will give you \$162,987 which the cleaners of rice in Canada made out of the transaction. Now, there are only two rice mills in this country, one in British Columbia and one in the city of Montreal; and, according to the statements made by the late Finance Minister, they employ seventy-five hands, though others say not forty. But taking the higher figure, if we paid \$1,000 to every man employed in the mills, it would leave \$87,987 of clear profit to an establishment which only employs seventy-five men. We contended in the past, and we contend now, that these profits were far too large, and that there should be a reduction of them, either in the form of decreased prices of