

into the exchequer without seriously affecting anybody's interest or making a drain on anybody's pocket. This was a delusion under which the people remained for a long time, but owing to the McKinley tariff more particularly, the people began to discover that the tariff was simply a tax which contributes to the support of the revenue or to the support of the individual who was reaping the benefit of the fiscal policy. But I am glad to know that under the influence of a high tariff the people of this country are being educated up to the truth. If 75 per cent of the community choose to go and enrich the remaining 25 per cent and pay their quota to add to the wealth of that 25 per cent they have themselves to blame for it. Unless the Government come down with the changes which they have foreshadowed to some degree, they will find a considerable upheaval in public opinion at the next election. They tell us in the next paragraph of the speech that they do propose to make some changes, which is an indication that, at all events to some extent, I am right. They say it is lopping off the mouldering branches. The minute you begin to lop off those branches you have to make the admission that the tariff was too high. If you take anything off cotton, is it not a fair admission that the cotton men are getting too much of an advantage and that their market was too heavily protected? You give them the raw material free and they have many other advantages. Selling in the country in which they manufacture, they have a great advantage over the foreign producer or manufacturer in the matter of freight, and they should be satisfied to a large extent with that. But the very fact of your consenting to lower the tariff is an admission that undue advantage is being taken by persons who are in those special lines of business which are so highly protected. Of course you will find, to use a vulgar expression, that somebody will squeal. If you begin to talk about taking away the privileges from a class they begin to remonstrate. They make it appear that their business is being injured. The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island spoke about the agricultural implements that we produce. I quite agree with him that we do produce as fine agricultural implements as are made in any country, and I think if the raw material were made free altogether our manufactures would be able to compete with the world. I

have no doubt that my hon. friend opposite was very much pleased when he saw those Massey-Harris agricultural implements for sale in Australia, and heard them so highly spoken of. It was a compliment to the country, and I am sure he felt justly proud. Now, why could not the Massey-Harris Company sell in Canada as well as in Australia? They send their machinery to Australia and there compete with the United States, Germany, Great Britain and all the rest of the world. Why should they have the privilege of making Canadian farmers pay more for their binders, or their reapers and mowers than they would pay in Australia? Of course the prices are increased in Australia, no doubt, because these articles are not manufactured there, but in Australia this company is in competition with those of the United States and on an equal footing. The hon. gentleman seems to think it was rather unfortunate that Prince Edward Island was used as a dumping ground for machines from the United States. I doubt very much whether he would find that the opinion met with general approval in Prince Edward Island. I think there are men there who would like to buy agricultural implements a little cheaper than they can be bought in Ontario during the last ten years—at all events give them a chance, let them have the opportunity, let them be the judges whether they will pay the Massey-Harris Company, or buy their agricultural implements in the United States, or in some other country. It is, of course, fair and proper to put a tax on these articles up to the point of the requirements of the revenue, but not above that point where the duty goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. It is a fair thing to tax anything coming into the country so long as that tax is shown to go directly into the public exchequer, but it ought not to be used as a lever to benefit the manufacturer in Canada. We come next to that paragraph in the Address in which we are asked to rejoice at the peaceful conclusion of the Behring Sea controversy. I am gratified that the Government did seek that method of settling this question. Whether the decision was for us or against us was quite immaterial, so far as concerns the propriety of the submission to arbitration. It is, of course, the true tribunal to which we refer all international subjects, and we must recognize the fact even though we may fail where we thought to