

have in the neighboring country. I have said a good deal in a jocular way about the different lords we have in the Senate—Lord Undertaker, Lord Coal, Lord Sugar, and others. But Lord Undertaker is not the worst of them. In conversation with him, what does he tell me? He says: "I only get one chance, and if I do charge 400 per cent. I do not get as much as the others do. Here comes Lord Sugar; he is at me all the time—he taxes me three times a day. You can see how much he takes in the lifetime of a man compared with what I take—I only get one chance. Here is Lord Flour, he taxes me for every meal I take." Gentlemen may say that there is no combination among the millers, but at a recent meeting of the Millers' Association at Listowel, one of them, named Plewes, advocated a combine over the country for the purpose of putting down the price of the farmers' wheat. It did not amount to much, because a man named Norris, of St. Catharines, would not go into the combine, and that broke it up. Then Lord Coal taxes us every time we get warmed, as Lord Coffin tells me. Lord Cotton taxes us every time we get a shirt, in his nice, smiling way and genial manner that I respect so much. We have Lord Shoddy, who taxes us every time we get a suit of clothes, and a man who dresses respectably must have four suits in the year. Lord Steel taxes us every time we buy hardware of any description. Lord Terra Cotta is young yet, but he is ready to take your money if you want to erect a fine building. And here, too, is my friend who has done a great service for the people of this country. I am surprised to see him acting in concert with the other lords to oppress the people of Canada—I refer to Lord Cold Water. I hope he will be spared to help us to promote the interests of the people at some future day. Supposing this Bill is thrown out, what will the people say of the Senate of Canada. They will say that the House of Commons has passed this Bill twice and sent it to the Upper House; we were asked to pass this measure in the interest of the large consuming population of Canada, yet we amended it last year so as to make it of no value. The House of Commons has again passed the Bill, and what are we going to do about it? If we do not pass in this year we will have to pass it next year—we will have to give way, and we

had better do it gracefully in the interest of the people. The 215 members of the House of Commons, representing the people directly, and answerable to the people, demand that this Bill shall become law. It is no clap-trap; you had better bow gracefully to the inevitable. Let the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House, and if there is anything wrong about it let us amend it; but I appeal to the House not to throw out the Bill and refuse to redress the grievances of which the people complain. In conclusion, let me remind hon. gentlemen that May's "Parliamentary Practice" says that lords that have a direct interest, or an interest at all, should not vote on a question of this kind; but of course it is left to their own honor, and I hope some of them will walk out.

HON. MR. DEVER—As I am about to vote somewhat inconsistently with my views on trade, I think it advisable that I should explain my position. It is this: I intend to vote to sustain the legislation of last year in the Senate. I do not think it is well for us to stultify ourselves and go back on that legislation until we have a full opportunity of knowing the result of it on the country. I am by conviction and training a Free Trader, and those who have preceded me are well known in this House and country to be Protectionists. My hon. friend from Quinté advocates a high tariff on oats, cheese and other commodities in which he is more or less interested. Others who are interested in manufacturing industries advocate protection. In doing so they are consistent, but I think it is not consistent when they refuse to extend the principle of protection to another class which combines in self-defence. They are not disposed to stand by protection on general principles. Viewing the matter in this light, I feel that the Senate has a right to sustain the legislation of last year, and I hope they will do so, though when I give expression to the hope I am far from agreeing with the arguments of some hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. One hon. member set forth that the merchants of this country are at present making very little profit on their transactions. He did not seem to see that the cause of this was that the merchants of this country at present are simply retailers. Formerly those merchants did an import trade from abroad under a Free