

past? Are Mr. Sifton and his colleagues to do precisely the same thing in order to gain a party triumph for the gentlemen who succeeded in the last election? What will it prove to the people of Canada? It will prove to them, and to the whole world, that the opposition in the Dominion parliament and the government of Manitoba were in collusion from the time the agitation began until the present moment, in order to assist in defeating the Conservative party—that they proposed then to come to some arrangement. If you can conceive of a more iniquitous understanding between parties, I should like my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to explain it to us. I leave that question to him. There are scores of other points in connection with this question to which I might refer, but to which I shall not at the present moment. My hon. friend the mover of the address gave us a long dissertation as to the duties of governments in the arrangement of a tariff. He quoted largely from the utterances of the late Minister of Finance, Mr. Foster. With every word he quoted I am heartily in accord. He pointed out in that speech what had been the experience of every statesman who has ever had anything to do with the forming of a tariff, or the changing of a tariff, or of the commercial policy of a country. Those who have read anything of history and studied anything of constitutional government, and more particularly the effect of protection upon the trade of a country and its development, know well that a young country, or a poor country, adopting protection will, of necessity, as years roll around and as the country becomes more wealthy and its manufacturers become stronger under a protective system and able to stand alone reduce the tariff and sometimes wholly remove it without detriment to existing industries. Why? Because the protection which they had received in the past enabled them to so manage their business as to be able to compete with foreign industries. Whether Canada has arrived at that period in her national life is questionable in my mind, and I think will also be a question in the minds of others. The platform of the Liberal party lays down the principle of a revenue tariff, and the hon. member from Halifax gave us his definition of a revenue tariff. His leader says he is a Liberal of the English school and a free trader pure and simple—that he is in favour of commer-

cial union or continental free trade, and afterwards unrestricted reciprocity. Which of these views are we to have to day? If I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Béchard), who spoke in his native tongue, he is in favour of free trade pure and simple. How to reconcile a revenue tariff with the declaration in this address that you are not to interfere with any existing interests is a problem that I think even the wise head of the Minister of Justice will find it difficult to solve. What is it that he can possibly do, under existing circumstances, without interfering with some interest, which would materially lighten the burdens of the people? They have told us that raw material must be free? If my hon. friend will look at the tariff he will find that almost every article that is used in the industries and manufactures of this country that is not produced in the Dominion, is free—almost every single article that is necessary to carry on successfully any enterprise is on the free list now. But the present Premier asks is iron free? Certainly not. Are you going to remove the duty from pig iron, which is the basis of all iron industries? And if you do, will you not interfere with some interest? If you take off the duty from raw material you will have to decide what constitutes raw material. The ore is the raw material for the man that makes the pig iron. The pig is the raw material for the man who produces the puddle bar and bar iron. The bar iron is the raw material of the man who makes horseshoes, and the nails and the horseshoe make the raw material of the man who puts the shoe on the horse, so if you are going to carry out your theory of removing the duty from raw materials, you will take it off every article in the country. My hon. friend from Marquette, who is the most ardent free trader we have, will say that everything is raw material. Did it require three months for the hon. gentleman to come to the conclusion, after the declarations they have made, that it was not necessary to remove the duty on pig iron? We have heard it announced by the hon. gentleman who was the Finance Minister of the former Liberal government, that the sugar interest in this country was legalized robbery. In fact, there is no language which could be taken from an English dictionary that was too strong to denounce the protected industries of the country. Does it require any consideration on the part of the hon. gentle-