

protection, and almost eulogizing union with the United States; singing pæans over the blessings of reciprocity; and groaning over the poor, wretched people who were destroyed by a scoundrelly tariff. And no sooner has he changed from one side of the House to the other than all that is forgotten. We have the Minister of Finance, also a great free trader, before he sat on the Treasury Bench, uttering an occasional free trade sentiment as by the force of habit, or by a trick of memory, and in the next breath coming out with an opposite opinion. In fact the mosaic of the Finance Minister's speech furnishes a most interesting study of the inconsequential. I fear that in making it he was haunted by the memory of the free trade leaders which he has written. We hear him giving utterance to a sound free trade doctrine, and then whipping out a strong protectionist idea. It is quite an interesting study: these gentlemen advocating principles and views which they entirely repudiated up to yesterday, but it is depressing when we think that a deadly blow has been struck at confidence in public men. If you ask how this tariff is received in Montreal, you are told that the Liberals do not like it, that they feel that they have been betrayed, while some Conservatives like it. You ask how it is received elsewhere, and you are told something similar. Well, Sir, there are four forces that put these gentlemen in power: the Liberal party, in which there are a large number of free traders; the Patrons; a certain number of farmers who believed that they would get advantages from a new Government, and some discontented Conservatives. But the great force which put them in power was of course the Liberal party, which contains a large number of free traders. But where are those free traders to-day? Where are the Patrons to-day? Written on their foreheads are the plain words, "Sold, but not paid for." They have been sold. This betrayal has dealt a mortal blow to constitutional government in Canada.

I spoke about the character of this measure. It is a thing of monstrous and portentous birth. Mr. Bengough, who did good service to Canada in other days, was accustomed, before and shortly after the Prime Minister came into power, to depict him in the "Globe" as a good Samaritan, lifting a drowning man out of the water or knocking the manacles off the ankles of a captive, and the drowning man and the captive were always represented as the western farmer; but since the feat of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, a change has come over the spirit of Mr. Bengough's dream. Here is what we have now. We have the new tariff horse with his pedigree described—sire, British Policy; dam, Protection. This is an extraordinary animal for a Liberal and free-trade Government to rear. Here is the leader of the Opposition

Mr. DAVIN.

depicted and the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) looking on, and here is the Finance Minister, in the guise of a sporting man, with his pocket handkerchief protruding in a jaunty way out of his side pocket. He is a sporting man, a horsey man, and we know what is the character of such gentlemen. We know we have to keep our eyes open and our eye-teeth skinned in order not to be done by them. Beneath we read the inscription: The new tariff foal—a sure winner; and we have Mr. Fielding, addressing the leader of the Opposition and the ex-Minister of Finance, saying: Out with it, gentlemen; do not be backward; say you never saw such a glandered, broken-winded, string-halted, ill-shaped, ill-acted and ill-bred colt in your lives. But don't you wish you owned him?

But the answer of these gentlemen is not given. "Why, you impudent thief, you have stolen him out of our stable and have put a little whitewash on his hind legs to try and conceal the theft, and you have given him a new name and call him yours." What is the pedigree they put forward? The dam Protection and the sire British Policy. I would like to find where in British policy and free trade as it is in England, you get the principle of a bonus or retaliation or preferential trade—all of them highly protective.

How is this policy likely to affect the country generally and the North-west Territories in particular? As to how it will affect the country, we have not had any calculations from hon. gentlemen opposite. We have had the great speech, as it is described in the "Globe," of the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding); we have heard from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright); and we have just now listened to the thundering tones of the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), but from none of these hon. gentlemen have we had a syllable to inform us how this tariff is going to affect the trade of the country, and we are compelled to make these calculations ourselves. The revenue from customs last year was, roughly speaking, \$20,000,000, and the year before it was between \$17,000,000 and \$18,000,000, and you will find that the customs revenue which we receive from the United States is something over one-third of the whole. Take \$7,000,000 from the \$20,000,000, and we have \$13,000,000 that will be affected by this tariff, because the favoured-nation clause will not only let in Belgium and Germany, but twenty-two other countries. But suppose we have not all these countries to reckon with, the great bulk of our customs income comes from England and the United States. Well, what will be the result? One-eighth off the \$13,000,000 will give you about \$1,750,000 for the first year, and then, when you take one-quarter off, you will have lost over \$3,000,000. How are you going to make that up? By customs? Then you will