

this. You know that protection to the manufacturer promises no certain reward to the labourer. You propose to take from him thirty-five dollars out of every hundred dollars that he spends on food, furniture, and clothing. How are you going to compensate him for this system of legalised blunder? Nothing has been established by a wider induction than this—that the cost of living may be increased without any increase of wages—increased frequently when wages are falling. Now, what is your policy of helping the working man? You dare not say to him that the price of labour is regulated by the law of supply and demand, and that you cannot prevent labour becoming cheap when it becomes abundant! You denied this. You called those who held to such theories, flies on the wheel. You belonged to a different class in political zoology. We ask you now to tell the House and the workingmen what you propose? This Parliament, you declared, could be made, in the hands of wise men, such as you yourselves modestly claimed to be, a benevolent institution for the relief of general distress, without any charge upon the National Treasury. I know, Mr. Speaker, that this is a part of the National Policy platform upon which gentlemen on that side stood at the last elections. It is a part about which they now do not care to hear. It is, no doubt, a disagreeable subject. It was most unhealthy food to give the poor man, but let me say to gentlemen on the Treasury benches, you gave it. You profited by its use, and now I ask you what do you propose to do? You brought crowds of labourers to the doors of Parliament last Session to demand work. You traded upon the misfortunes and the sufferings of the poor. You told the country that, if you were put upon those benches, you would untie your bag and exhibit your “ready relief.” It is not yet forthcoming. When is it to be exhibited? It is, Sir, to me a matter of astonishment to find gentlemen still at large advocating the interposition of Parliament, not to remove the shackles of a darker age, but to impose new shackles upon industry, upon commerce, not for reasons of State, but to contribute to the production of wealth. Do hon. gentlemen propose to fix the price of

commodities by Act of Parliament? Do they propose to take into consideration the advantages or disadvantages of locality, and vary their protection accordingly? When I speak of gentlemen being at large, I did not mean to include the Minister of Finance. We know he is not. He may not have been confined, but he is, and has been, in the custody of a self-constituted national police. They have taken possession of him, and he sits here as their hostage, and as the exponent of their demands. They have put him and his colleagues where they are. They have made these hon. gentlemen officially what they are, and they are bound to perform the work assigned to them by their masters. This body is distinct from the Tory party. They will support Ministers just so long, and no longer, than it is their interest to do so. We know, Sir, the Tory party. They are, under the guardianship of the Premier, and are whatever he may desire them to be. They are his people, the goats of his pasture. They follow him. When he favours Free-trade, so do they. But they have instinctive preferences, and, when he proposes a Jingo policy, even though it be in a small way, they are specially pleased. It is true the hon. gentleman has a large majority in this House, but when we look at the electoral vote, we know that the hon. gentleman has not a large majority outside; we know that, upon the policy of Protection, the country is nearly equally divided. Nearly one-half have pronounced against the course which gentlemen opposite vaguely proposed to take. We see how far you have gone, and what you have still to undertake. I know, Sir, it has become fashionable on that side of the House to deride political economy. Smith and Mill, Cairnes and Fawcett are regarded as visionaries whom men of common sense, whom real statesmen, would never consult. Well, Sir, I am afraid but few of the men, who, in England have, for the past forty years, been regarded as statesmen would escape this ban. I look at the speeches of Huskisson, Villiers, C. P. Thompson, Sir James Graham, Sir Robert Peel, the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord Palmerston, and Lord Russell; and, in the discussion of financial subjects, I find them

every  
from  
upon  
class  
vision  
habit  
doma  
know  
side  
delu  
whic  
turn  
atory  
made  
men,  
Levi  
by wh  
been  
centu  
dislik  
under  
than  
atmos  
vigor  
We m  
this c  
Sir, v  
with  
dissere  
augus  
will v  
imitat  
Wash  
wise.  
mena  
lation  
cated  
his su  
to wh  
Sir,  
War  
in o  
millio  
prope  
for  
and  
other  
true  
the si  
ple or  
of tha  
posed  
succes  
To e  
garde  
things  
that  
stood