Board of Works

Continued from 1st page)

ernment in 1885 we had sunk so low that we were in a worse condition than the United States at the close of the civil war, that we were on the verge of ruin, and if, after six years more, we had so far recovered our position, we had so far regained what we had lost, that unless we had a failure of the harvest, we were not even within a measurable distance of a financial crisis, I thought, according to the hon. gentleman's own estimate, we had at last reached a position of safety, and Mr. Speaker, that statement did inspire me with hope for the future. I believe that we can look forward to six more years of Conservative rule, and if we can advance in the past as we have, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, advanced in the last six years, we will reach a position where our prosperity will stand upon so solid a foundation, that not even a bad harvest or any other ordinary calamity can seriously affect us. Now, with regard to the first portion of the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as I said, I, for one, do not feel disposed to find very much fault with it. The present Government have never had as a part of their policy, the imposition of high taxation upon articles of prime necessity, or upon articles which our artizans, and miners, and fishermen, and farmers usually consume; on the contrary, their policy has been just the reverse. Their policy has been to reduce that class of duties, and it was in pursuance of that policy that years ago they removed the duties from tea and coffee; and that policy has its consummation this year in the removal of the sugar duties. Let me ask the attention of the House, and I will do it very briefly, to the sources from which our revenue is derived. Our taxation consists of Customs and Excise duties. I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns of last year, that the revenue from these sources amounted to $31,500,000; of that sum $10,500,000 was derived from liquor and tobacco; $4,000,000 more was derived from taxes on articles which may fairly be classed as luxuries; and about $4,000,000 more was derived from a class of articles, which if they cannot be considered as luxuries, cannot, at all events, be said to be articles of prime necessity or articles which are commonly used by the people of this country. We have remaining $13,000,000, and in this $13,000,000 are included duties upon provisions and breadstuffs, duties collected on cotton, woollen and hardware manufactures, and a variety of others, including the duties upon sugar and molasses. By the action of the Government this session $3,000,000 of that $13,000,000 is swept away by the removal of the sugar duties, and any gentleman who examines the returns will find that we can make another large reduction on the $10,000,000 remaining, by taking out the expensive class of woollen and cotton goods, and some classes of hardware, and a good many articles included under the head of provisions, which are consumed exclusively by the wealthier classes of the people, and are not in general use among the class of the people described in the resolution of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). And, Sir, if my calculation is correct, half of even that $10,000,000 would be taken away by eliminating the articles of which I refer, and that would leave about $5,000,000 of a revenue which is raised upon articles of prime necessity, and upon articles which our artisans, and miners, and fishermen, and farmers ordinarily consume. Hon. gentleman will observe that this is about $1 per head of our population. They may say that I have made too low an estimate; it is possible that I have, but I have made it as near as I could to the correct estimate. Let us suppose that this is a $1.25 or even $1.50 taxation per head of our population, and I do not think there is any fair-minded man in this House who will say that this an excessive amount of taxation for even the poorest classes of this country to pay. I will remind the House that there is an offset even to that, for it must be remembered that from our Dominion treasury, we pay back to the treasuries of the different provinces, 80 cents per head of their population, to be used in keeping up their institutions, maintaining their schools, and for other local purposes; so that anyone who will go into a fair examination of the sources of our revenue at the present time will find that the classes of people referred to in this resolution, our artisans, miners, fishermen, and farmers, contributed a mere insignificant fraction upon articles of prime necessity and common use to the revenue of this country, and that the poorer classes of the people contribute almost nothing to the interest on our public debt, to the cost of maintaining our Federal Government, or to the construction of our public works. I, therefore, do not object very much to the policy proposed in the first part of the resolution of the member of South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), because I say it is the very policy which this Government have been pursuing for the last twelve years. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), if he wished to introduce that policy, might have introduced it fifteen years ago. He might have introduced it in 1876-77 or 1878 with very great advantage to the country, but in those years the hon. gentleman had a different policy. The state of the country was such, to use his own words, that it was necessary then to increase the duties on tea and coffee and sugar, upon woollen manufactures, and cotton manufactures, and hardware manufactures, and upon every article you could name which our artisans, our miners, our fishermen, and our farmers commonly use in this Dominion. It is gratifying to know that the honorable gentleman is able at this late day to come to the conclusion that the circumstances of the country at last justify a change of policy. It is gratifying to know that after twelve years of experience, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has at last arrived at the conclusion that the policy which this present Government have been pursuing for the last twelve years, is the correct policy to be adopted for the future in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish before I close to ask the indulgence of the House while I refer to the latter part of the hon. gentleman's resolution. This deals with our trade relations with the United States, and it is I suppose, the most important question, the most live issue, which we have to discuss at the present time. As my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) pointed out the other day, this portion of the resolution is rather indefinite in its character. It may mean the unrestricted reciprocity which the hon. member for South Oxford has been advocating since 1888, or it may mean the more restricted reciprocity which my hon. frend from Queen's, New Brunswick (Mr. King), expressed himself anxious and willing to accept. However, taking the language which the member for South Oxford used in the speech delivered in connection with this resolution, we are perhaps safe in assuming that the hon. gentleman still adheres to the policy of 1888, and that this resolution means the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to express the surprise which I felt in 1888, and which I felt from that time to the present, that gentlemen occupying the position in this House which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) do, should submit to this House, a proposal so utterly absurd and impracticable as is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. These hon. gentlemen have on more than one occasion defined their position on this question. They tell us, that their policy is for these two countries to have free and unrestricted trade in natural products and manufactured articles; and my answer to them is: that two countries situated as Canada and United States are, living under different goverments, having different laws, having different tariffs with each free to regulate and change its own tariff as it wishes, could not possibly under any considerations, adopt unrestricted reciprocity or free trade. I can perhaps best illustrate my view of this question by referring to the effect of unrestricted reciprocity upon one or two leading articles of commerce between these two countries. Take, if you will, woollen goods. Every person knows that the United States imposes high duties upon wool--upon some classes 11 cents, and upon other classes 12 cents a pound. Upon washed wools the duty is double that amount, and upon scoured wools it is three times that amount. The duties on woollen yarns are also very high, varying from 125 to 140 per cent. The duties on knitted and other classes of manufactured woollen goods vary from 100 to 150 per cent. The United States import annually upwards of 100,000,000 pounds of wool. Now, we all know that in Canada wool is imported free of duty. Wool is a natural product of both of these countries. If under the circumstances I have described unrestricted reciprocity between the United States and Canada were adopted, it must be evident to any one that that 100,000,000 pounds of wool instead of being imported directly into the United States, where it would pay a duty of 11 or 12 cents a pound would come into Canada free and be here converted into woolen yarns or fabrics which would pass into the United States free of duty. What would be the result? The United States would lose the import trade in wool, they would lose the revenue they derive from it, their manufacturing industries would be injured, and the whole trade of the country would be disturbed. I could give other illustrations of the same thing. I might refer to the article of flax which is a natural product of both countries. The United States import annually 8,000 tons of flax, on which there is a duty of 1 cent a pound, or $20 a ton on undressed, and 3 cents a pound, or $60 a ton on dressed. In Canada undressed flax comes in free, while dressed pays a duty of 1 cent a pound, or $20 a ton. It is evident that in that case the result of unrestricted reciprocity would be precisely the same as that which I have already described in the case of wool. I might give other illustrations but I do not wish to weary the house. The same results would follow from a change in the tariff duties of either country, at any time. To illustrate this, let me point to the iron industries of the two countries. Iron is a natural product of both Canada and the United States. We have manufactures in this line established in both countries. The duties in the United States are much higher than they are in this country. The American duties are 75 cents a ton on iron ore, $6 a ton on pig iron, from $16 to $20 a ton on bar iron and 40 per cent. on steel ingots. The Canadian duties are $2 a ton on ferro-manganese, $4 a ton on pig iron, $13 a ton on bar iron, and 30 per cent. on steel ingots. Suppose unrestricted reciprocity were adopted by these two countries, and either country removed these duties; suppose Canada removed the duties entirely, what would be the result? Iron would be brought into this country from Europe; it would be converted here into different classes of hardware; then it would go into the United States free of duty; and the result on the import trade, the revenue, the manufacturers and the domestic trade of the United States would be precisely the same as in the other cases to which I have referred. Now, it must be apparent to any intelligent man that the United States, a proud and independent people, would never be willing to place themselves in such a position with respect to this Dominion that their import trade could be cut off, their revenues reduced, their manufactures injured, and their domestic trade affected by a change in the tariff regulations of this country. And, Sir, I claim that it is equally absurd to suppose that we in this Dominion, though we are the smaller and the weaker people, would ever be willing to place ourselves in a position so humiliating in relation to our neighbours to the south. Why, Sir, it must be apparent to any intelligent man who has given even the most superficial study to this question, that we can have unrestricted reciprocity or free trade between these two countries in natural products and manufactured goods on one condition, and one condition only, that is, on the condition of uniformity of tariff. That is the opinion expressed by every intelligent statesman in the United States who has ever expressed an opinion on the question. That is the opinion expressed by every leading newspaper in the Republic. It is the opinion expressed by Mr. Goldwin Smith; it is the opinion expressed by Mr. Wiman; and it was, at all events at one time, the opinion expressed by my hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I., (Mr. Davies.) It is not necessary for me to read the opinions of these men, for they have been read at different times by those who have addressed this House. Now, Sir, what does uniformity of tarriff involve? The first question that presents itself is, how are the tariffs to be assimilated, and how is this uniformity in the tariffs to be maintained in the future? That is a question to which hon. gentlemen opposite have not yet given a definite answer; it is a question which they have not discussed, for they very wisely avoid its discussion. When they reach this point in their argument, their more serious difficulties begin. We have had, however, suggestions on the subject. We have been told by Mr. Wiman and Mr. Hitt that the only way in which this arrangement can be brought about is to have a joint commission which shall assimilate our tariffs and regulate them in the future, and on which the two countries shall be fairly represented. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? The United States have 65,000,000 people and we have 5,000,000. That means that they will have thirteen representatives on this commission and we shall have one. I would like to ask any member of this House if he would be willing to leave any matter in which he is personally interested to any commission on which the other side would have thirteen representatives and he would have one. Does he think he would get justice from such a tribunal? With such proportions, whose opinions would prevail? If this commission is to assimilate the two tariffs, does any man think that the tariff of the United States would be assimilated to the tariff of Canada, or the tariff cf Canada to that of the United States? Why, sir, the result is too obvious to admit of argument. It simply means that this country must adopt the tariff of the United States, that we must for all future time submit the regulation of our tariff to a tribunal in which that country would have the controlling interest. I do not believe that that proposition would ever be seriously entertained by the people of this country. If the people of this country would ever consent to any such arrangement as that, I confess that the spirit of liberty must indeed be dead among us. The power to regulate our tariff is the power to regulate our taxation. This is a right which every free and independent people prize. It was to secure this very right that the people of the United States themselves, more than a hundred years ago, took up arms against Great Britain. They demanded, fought for, and secured their independence, simply because the British government, without their authority and against their will, sought to impose a tax upon their commerce and restrictions upon their trade; and we, who live in this Dominion, have in the past years not been less jealous of this sacred right than our neighbors across the line. The battle for self-government was fought out in this country just as it was there, not, it is true, in the battle field, but in the halls of our own provincial legislatures, in the press, upon every platform and from every pulpit in this country; and as the result we have in this country to-day the fullest measure of liberty and freedom which any proud and independent people could desire. We have the perfect and absolute control of our own affairs. We have a constitution framed by our own statesmen, we make our own laws, regulate our own tariffs, and we fix for ourselves both the methods and the measure of our taxation. These are rights, these are privileges, which no free or independent people would barter away for any trade privileges or any commercial advantages, however great they might be. Why, sir, rather than place ourselves in that position, annexation itself would be preferable. Under annexation we would, at least, have some voice in making the laws by which we would be governed, whereas, under this arrangement, we have absolutely none. Hon. gentlemen may endeavor to conceal it as they will, but the sure and inevitable result of adopting this policy, in any form you wish, whether as unrestricted reciprocity, or free trade, or commercial union, must be the political union of the two countries. Unrestricted reciprocity, without uniformity of tariff, is a practical absurdity. Unrestricted reciprocity with uniformity of tariff means that we must adopt the tariff of the United States and submit the regulation of our tariff for the future to a tribunal in which they would have a controlling influence. That would place us in a position, in relation to our neighbours to the south, so helpless and so dependent, that we must sooner or later yield to the inevitable fate and become part and parcel of the great Republic. I feel that this argument alone is sufficient to condemn the proposal of my hon. friend. I believe that such a policy is utterly repugnant to the feelings of the true and loyal people of this country.

If the House will indulge me although it is getting very late, I would like, before I close, to offer a few observations upon the commercial aspect of this question, and I will endeavour to make my remarks as brief as possible. If this policy of unrestricted reciprocily or free trade is practicable is it desirable? What would be the effect of adopting it upon the great and important interests of this country? Take, first, the manufacturing interest. Under the policy of the present Administration, our manufactures have had great growth and prosperity. I do not wish to enlarge upon this point, for it can be proved by the growth of our manufacturing town, by our imports of machinery for manufacturing purposes, by our increased consumption of coal, and by the increased traffic on our railways. It can be most conclusively proved by the increase in the imports of raw material. The imports of raw material in 1878 for manufacturing purposes amounted to $5,000,000; in 1890 they reached $16,500,000. I have already referred to the sugar trade and the 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar we consume, nearly every pound of which is refined in our own country and distributed by our own merchants to our own consumers. All the wool grown in the country we manufacture, and we import 8,000,000 lbs. besides. We manufacture, annually in the country 35,000,000 to 40,000,000 lbs. of raw cotton. Last year we imported of raw material $3,760,000 and we manufactured cotton goods to the extent of $3,840,000, after deducting the exports. These amounts are practically the same; and if you will allow for the difference between the values of the raw material and the manufactured goods, you will find that three fourths of all the cotton used in the country is the manufacture of our own mills. We manufacture all the hides produced in the country and $1,000,000 besides. Our imports and exports were about the same, so that practically we manufacture all the leather goods consumed in the country. We manufacture nearly all the tin goods consumed in the country. We manufacture all the iron produced, and besides import upwards of 150,000 tons of pig iron and scrap iron and steel for manufacturing purposes. These are great and important industries, and very many, if not all of them, owe their existence and prosperity to the National Policy. They can only continue to exist and prosper while that policy is maintained. Unrestricted reciprocity, or free trade, and the National Policy are directly antagonistic. If you have the one, you must abandon the other. If you adopt unrestricted reciprocity, you strike a blow at all those great and important industries which owe their very existence and prosperity to the National Policy and will undo all that has been done in this direction during the past twelve years. The effect upon our trade and upon our manufacturing industries will be equally disastrous. I will not enlarge upon this point as I have already spoken too long. Our sugar trade gives us a direct import trade with sugar-producing countries. Previous to 1879, the tea consumed in Canada was bought in London and New York. Under the policy of this Administration, of the 18,000,000 lbs. we consumed last year more than half came direct from China and Japan. The cotton we use comes direct from the southern cotton fields. The raw materials imported into this country for manufacturing purposes, under the policy of the present Administration, bring to our seaports thousands of tons of shipping annually, which is the direct result of tariff legislation. Free trade with the United States would simply transfer this trade from our own seaports to New York and Boston. The hon. member for South Oxford in that speech which he delivered in Boston said this:

"You lie within very easy distance of our chief cities and of the most populous portions of our Dominion."

This was addressed to the merchants of the city of Boston.

"In one word, given free trade with Canada, and you rise at one stride from the position, in some respects, of a frontier city, with no great extent of territory secured to you, to that of a central entrepot, with the practical monopoly of a great region behind you, whose commerce no man can take away from you."

The hon. gentleman perhaps never uttered a more unpatriotic sentiment, but at the same time he never made a more truthful statement than he made in the city of Boston. Adopt unrestricted reciprocity or free trade with the United States, and in less than ten years you will transfer the great import trade of the river St. Lawrence and also a large portion of the export trade to New York and Boston, and you will leave the seaports of the Maritime Provinces bare of shipping as the seaports of the New England States are today. Let me ask attention to the effect of this policy upon the development of our mineral resources. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred the other day to the great value of the mineral resources of this country. He did not over-estimate them. It is impossible to over-estimate our mineral resources. It is impossible to estimate the great wealth that lies buried beneath our soil in every portion of this dominion. Our mineral resources should be one of the greatest if not the greatest source of our wealth in the future. It is of the utmost importance that our mineral resources should be developed in such a manner as to contribute to the wealth of the country, and the wealth does not consist only in the value of the ores which lie beneath the soil, or the labour of those who dig the ores from the bowels of the earth, but the chief value of this mineral wealth lies in the labour required to convert that raw material into articles of use and articles of commerce. How is that to be accomplished? It is desirable that manufactories should be established in this country for the purpose of converting the raw material into manufactured goods, and that can only be done by maintaining the absolute control of our tariff legislation. Adopt the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite advocate, and you at once place it in the power of American capitalists to come here, to purchase our valuable mines, to obtain control of the means of transportation, to dig our valuable ores from the bowels of the earth and carry them away as fast as rail and steam can carry them, and furnish our raw materials for the manufactures of other countries. That may be the policy of hon. gentleman opposite, but it is a policy to which I for one am entirely opposed. Under that policy, we would be placed in such a position that the results I have described would inevitably follow, but we would be utterly powerless to prevent those results for we would be bound by the terms of a solemn treaty under the provisions of which we could not place an export duty on the raw material or an import duty on the manufactured goods.

Now let me say a few words as to the effects of this policy on the agricultural interest of the country, and I admit that, in treating this branch of the subject, I am coming to what hon. gentlemen consider their great stronghold. They appeal to the farmers to support their policy because they say the farmers will be greatly benefited by it. Many of them admit that our manufacturing industries may be injured and our trade disturbed by the adoption of such a policy, but they contend that the benefits which will result to the farmers, that great and important class of the community, will be so great as to more than compensate for any loss which may otherwise take place. I propose to test the soundness of that argument. They tell us that the United States is the natural market for the natural products of this country. How do they prove that? They point to our export of agricultural products to the United States. It is true that we export some sixteen millions and a half of dollars' worth to the United States. Of that, barley is nearly one-half, and the rest is comprised of horses, sheep, eggs, potatoes and hay. These articles embrace nearly all our exports of agricultural products to the United States. Now, let us see what there is on the other side. In 1889, we imported upwards of 15,000,000 lbs. of pork against a duty of 1 cent a lb.; of bacon and hams we imported 3,653,000 lbs. against a duty of 2 cents a lb.; of beef we imported 3,795,000 lbs. against a duty of 1 cent a lb.; of lard we imported 8,287,000 lbs. against a duty of 2 cents a lb.; of tallow we imported 615,000 lbs. against a duty of 1 cent a lb., and of butter we imported 492,000 lbs. against a duty of 4 cents a pound. If, from those figures which I have read, it can be fairly argued that the United States is the natural market for Canadian barley, eggs, potatoes and hay, by the same reasoning it can be proved that the Dominion of Canada is the natural market for American pork, beef, butter, lard and corn. Hon. gentlemen tell us that if the duties were removed the increase exports of agricultural products would benefit our farmers. By the same reasoning the imports of the American agricultural products to which I have referred would injure our farmers, and it must be remembered that any arrangement which obtains for us free access to the markets of the United States opens our markets to the products of the United States. Last session this parliament increased the duty on American beef and pork, and I believe that action met the approval of the agricultural portion of the community. If we had free trade with the United States, American beef and pork and corn would come in here free, and would destroy the advantages which our farmers enjoy in that regard at the present time. I may be told that we produce here all the beef we require for local consumption, and that we export large quantities of it to Great Britain, and that therefore we are in a position to compete successfully with any other country in that article. I admit that as a general rule that theory is correct, but I contend that there are exceptional circumstances in regard to this article. The production of beef for Great Britain and the production of beef for our local markets are two different things. Those who are engaged in raising cattle for export to the English markets are the wealthier and the smaller portion of the farmers of this country. I believe nine-tenths of the whole farming community depend not upon the English market but upon the local market for the sale of their productions, and a very large proportion of those farmers would be injured if the duties were removed. It is true that the removal of the duties between the two countries would increase the trade between them. The fair way is to take on the one hand the advantages which would result from our having free access to the American markets and the disadvantages which would result if we gave the Americans free access to our markets, and then to decide upon which side the balance of advantage lies. I admit that, in deciding the question there would be great diversity of opinion. If I may be allowed to express my individual opinion, I believe the balance of advantage, if there were any, would be very small indeed in favor of the farmers in this country; and I believe that if this policy is ever adopted no class of people in this country will be more bitterly disappointed with the result than those who expect that greater advantages and more prosperity will result from its adoption. It is true that trade would increase, but that trade would be in the nature of an exchange. We would sell them barley and we buy their corn. There would be a large and no doubt a profitable business done in the small classes of agricultural products such as eggs, fowls, vegetables and some other articles of that kind, but the trade would be merely in the nature of an exchange, and the advantage, if any, might be in favor of either one country or the other according as favourable crops or other local circumstances affected the relative supply and demand in the two countries in different years. The United States can no more be said to be our natural market for the agricultural products of this country, than Canada can be said to be the natural market for the agricultural products of the United States. Every person knows that Great Britain is the natural market for the surplus products of both countries. Now it would appear to me that if we cannot obtain a reasonable arrangement with the United States for the exchange of agricultural products, it is of the very greatest importance to our farmers that, in the first place, we should retain control of our own markets. Our own markats are our most important and our most valuable markets at the present time. The home market of this country to-day takes the great bulk of all the agricultural produce of this country; it is not only a large market, but it is a growing market, and every year in the future it wil be larger than it is at the present time. I say I believe it is for the interest of the farmers, if they cannot get a fair treaty with the United States, to retain control of their own markets first, and then to devote their attention to the cultivation of such classes of agricultural products and securing such means of communication with Great Britain and other foreign countries, as will enable them to place their surplus products in foreign countries whare they will be a permanent demand at remunerative prices. There is no doubt that the McKinley Bill, in its operation at the present time, is injuriously affecting some of the agricultural interests of this country, and I desire to say a few words in regard to the operation of that Bill. In my opinion, at least, it is a Bill of a most extraordinary character. If I may be allowed to express an opinion here, I will say that I believe the provisions of that measure, so far as they affect the agricultural interests of this country, reflect no credit either upon its author or upon the Congress which made it law. That Bill professes to be of protective measures; in very many respects it is the most highly protective measure. It surrounds many of the manufacturing industries of the United States with a wall of protection over which it is absolutely impossible for any foreign competitor to climb. But when it deals with the agricultural products of this country it assumes a different character; it cannot be said in any true sense to be a protective measure; it is rather a prohibitory measure. The American farmers, und the old tariff, had all the protection that was of any advantage to them. They had almost the absolute monopoly of their home markets under the old tariff, and the increase tariff cannot give them any better markets than they had before. There is, perhaps, one exception, and that is the article of barley. And what are the facts with regard to that article! There is no reasonable man in this house who will not say that ten cents a bushel duty upon barley, as under the old tariff, was not a sufficient protection in any country for one farmer against his neighbor. The reason, if I am correctly informed, that they continued to import barley under a duty of ten cents a bushel into the United States, was because the quality of Canadian barley was superior to that of American barley. Now sir, the increase of duty cannot improve the character of the American barley, and if it has the effect, as it probably will have, of shutting Canadian barley out, it simply compels the American brewers to use an inferior grain, and the American consumer to drink an inferior class of beer. But when we leave that article and take the article of wheat, we find that the Americans not only controlled their own markets, but they exported 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 bushels besides. Their total imports only amounted to less than 130,000 bushels. In horses their imports were less than 20,000; in sheep their imports were less than 400,000; in potatoes, there were only three-quarters of a millions bushels imported and in hay about 100,000 tons. Now, as the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) pointed out the other evening, these imports are so small they are so utterly insignificant, compared with the productions of the United States, and compared with the enormous consumption of 65,000,000 of people, that they could not affect the market prices. If these articles are shut out altogether, as they may be under the McKinley bill, the prices of these articles generally will not be affected in the markets of the United States. That additional protection is of no advantage to the farmers, it does not increase their prices in ordinary years, it does not tend in any way to develop the agricultural interest of that country. Of course there will be exceptional years when crops may fail, when the supply may not be equal to the demand; but in those years what will be the result? The American consumer will be obliged to pay the Canadian price, and the enormous duty added. The only result would be to tax the country heavily, and the only other effect would be to reduce the consumption by this insignificant amount, and to that extent injure the trade of this Dominion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I felt curious to know what motive could induce the Congress of the United States to adopt such extraordinary legislation, and I confess that I have not been able, up to the present time, to find a satisfactory answer to that question. I have taken the trouble to read the speech of Mr. McKinley, who was the author of that Bill. I find that he defended his measure in many cases with very great ability, and I believe with very great success, where he could show that by the increase of duties he would be able to encourage the establishment of new industries in the United States, and give employment to more capital and more labor, and that the people generally will be benefited. But when he came to the part of his Bill which dealt with the agricultural products of this Dominion, those arguments failed him, and I find that he dismissed this part of the subject by simply quoting an extract from a speech delivered by Professor Goldwin Smith, and several extracts from the speeches delivered in this Parliament by "the Hon. John Charlton, a member of the House of Commons of Canada." Even those speeches furnished him with no argument to show that the American people could be benefited by this increased duty. The extracts which he read merely showed that if our farmers were shut out from the American markets, they could be injured by this increase of duties. Now, Sir, it has occurred to me, although I am not in a position to prove it, that Mr. McKinley had been reading from that remarkable pamphlet which was written by Mr. Farrer. We all know that Mr. Farrer, in a pamphlet which he addressed to some of the prominent men in the United States, advised as the means by which this country could be forced into annexation, that congress should place very high duties upon everything we produce. Well, sir, it may be that Mr. McKinley has had access to that pamphlet, or he may not; I cannot say. It may be that Mr. McKinley is acquainted with Mr. Farrer; or he may not be; I do not know. It may be that Mr. McKinley is desirous of seeing this country annexed to the United States, or he may be indifferent on that subject; I do not know his opinion. But it is at least to my mind a significant fact that what Mr. Farrer advised in that pamphlet was precisely what Mr. McKinley did.

Before leaving this branch of the subject I wish to say that so far as I am concerned, at all events, do not I believe there is any necessity for the Dominion of Canada to sacrifice any of its important interests to obtain relief from the provisions of that act. I believe we can look for relief from a different source. I believe we can rely upon the common sense and sound judgment of the American people themselves. I believe the great mass of the American people are honest, honorable and practical men, that they desire to be governed in their commercial dealings and in their legislative actions towards this country by honorable and generous motives and not by selfish motives. I do not believe that the great mass of the American people when they come fully to consider this subject will consent to allow to remain on their statute-book the provisions of an act which, while it cannot benfit their own farmers or any interests in their own country, simply has the effect of injuring to some slight extent the trade of a neighboring and a friendly people. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his speech the other day, said that—

"If there be any truth in the indication of popular sentiment in the United States, there is a very strong probability that the United States are more likely to reduce their tariff a great deal than to raise it, and here the difficulty which hon. gentlemen opposite fear is likely to a great extent to disappear in the course of the next few months, or at furthest in the course of the next year or two."

If I understand the view which the hon. gentleman has expressed in these words correctly, I fully agree with him. I believe there already are indications that this result will very soon be brought about. It must be remembered that the elections which have taken place in the United States since the passage of that Bill have entirely changed the political complexion of the legislatures of that country. It must be remembered that the people of the United States have told Mr. McKinley, and those who supported him in passing that measure in Congress, that they do not believe in that policy and that they will dispense with their services in the future, for their usefullness as legislators has gone. I do not wish it to be understood from my remarks that I am opposed to extending our trade with the United States.

Mr. Paterson (Brant.) It is well you said that.

Mr. Wood. I am very glad the hon. gentlemen opposite endorse that statement, and I hope they will endorse the few remarks I have yet to make. I say to the hon. gentleman for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) that I do not oppose, I never have been opposed, the Government which I am supporting, I believe, have never been opposed to extending our trade relations with the United States. On the contrary, I am desirous, and I believe the Government is desirous, of seeing our trade extended to the very fullest possible extent.

Mr. McMullen. You are disloyal.

Mr. Wood—The hon. gentleman will change his opinion if he hears me through.

Mr. Landerkin. You talk like Farrer.

Mr. Wood. To the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin,) I say that I desire to see our trade extended to the fullest possible limit, provided it can be done on fair, equitable and mutually advantageous terms. I should be glad to see our trade extended to the very fullest possible extent consistent with the preservation of our own interests and the maintenance of our own independence as a people. I do not object to the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite because it proposes to extend our trade with the United States. That is not the reason that I object to it. I object to the policy because it proposes to give to the United States the absolute control of the trade and commerce of this conntry. Hon. gentlemen claim that if their policy were adopted, our trade with the United States would be increased. I admit it. There is nothing more certain than that, if they place us in that position, we will be compelled to buy everything from the United States, and compelled to go there to sell every single article we have to dispose of. Hon. gentlemen propose to give us free admission to the markets of the United States, but on what terms? At the same time they raise around this country a wall that practically cuts us off from Great Britain and from all the world beside. If we are to have free trade I say let us have free trade with Great Britain and all the world. Let us last of all adopt a policy of free trade that while it has none or very few of the advantages of absolute free trade has all its disadvantages and imposes on us all its burdens. Hon. gentlemen opposite think I am sympathizing with their policy in this matter; but I may tell them that I have always, and do at the present time very strongly sympathize with those who advocate free trade principles. Let me tell hon. gentlemen more than that. I believe free trade principles are perfectly sound, and that the arguments of many of them by which they are supported are perfectly unanswerable, but at the same time I do not believe that free trade principles can be applied to all countries at all times and under all circumstances. I can say to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I entirely differ with him when he says that free trade can be safely applied in the Dominion at the present time. I believe free trade is applicable to a country like Great Britain, a country which after years of protection has concentrated within itself great wealth, mechanical skill, the most improved machinery and has placed herself in a position that she can, as she has done in the past, maintain for years to come her commercial and manufacturing supremacy against the world. I believe free trade might be adopted in the United States today with very much greater safety than it could be adopted here. If there is one country among the three to which this principle is not applicable at the present time it is this Dominion, a young country with a large territory, with great resources yet undeveloped, with limited capital and with a sparse population. Under these circumstances it would be, in my opinion, utterly foolish for this Dominion at the present time to adopt free trade either with the United States or with Great Britain. If we wish in this country to develop our resources, and to utilize them to our own advantage; if we wish concurrently to settle our agricultural land, to develop our mineral resources, and to establish manufacturing industries in this country; if we wish to give to the farmers of this country the largest possible home market, and the very best market which they can have; if we wish to develop to the fullest possible extent our internal trade, to promote the largest exchange of commodities between the different classes of our people, and different sections of our own country; we can only do it by adopting and by maintaining the protective policy. And, Sir, at the same time, if we wish to extend our foreign trade, if we wish to direct it into those channels where it will be of the greatest advantage to ourselves, if we wish to use it to build up our own seaports in preference to those of a foreign country; if we wish it to be the means of building up in this country great commercial cities, of enlarging and extending the transactions of our wholesale merchants, of furnishing traffic to our railways and employment to our working classes, we can only accomplish these results by judicious tariff legislation. That, Sir, has been the policy of this Government in the past, and it has been eminently successful. We have, during the past twelve years, under that policy, enjoyed a prosperity which has been almost a marvel to ourselves, and which has commanded the admiration and called forth the praise of every civilized nation on the face of the earth. That policy has been called the National Policy, and it has been well named, for it has not merely contributed to our material prosperity, but it has created our national life. It has given birth to national hopes, and to national aspirations; it has created in this country a national unity, a national independence, to which we were utter strangers a quarter of a century ago, and of which we are justly proud to-day. There are, Mr. Speaker, two courses for this country to pursue in the future. We can go on in the same course that we have been travelling in the past. We can continue to develop our resources, to establish new industries, to extend our trade according to our own methods and for our own advantage, and we can build up on the northern portion of the continent a great, powerful, prosperous and independent people; a portion of the British Empire owing allegiance to the British flag, and enjoying its protection. Or, Sir, we can take the opposite course. We can adopt the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite advise. We can abandon the policy which we have pursued for the last ten years, and hand over the enormous wealth of our mines, our forests, our fields, to build up the manufacturing industries of a foreign county, to build up great manufacturing cities, to furnish both food and employment for their people, and ultimately, we can sever the ties that bind us to the mother country, and losing even our identity and independence as a people, become a very insignificant fringe upon the outskirts of the neighbouring Republic. I trust, Sir, that this House of Commons will not hesitate in deciding which of these two policies they will adopt. I trust we will on this occasion pronouce, as the the people of this country have already pronounced, a most emphatic condemnation upon this policy which is both unpatriotic and impracticable, and fraught only with the greatest danger to every important interest in this country.

HIS LARIAT SAVED HER.

A Pleasing Tale of a Cowboy's Prowess and Presence of Mind.

CHAMBERLAIN, S. D., July 20.—Among the tales of the round-up of cattle west of the Missouri River that have drifted into the border towns is one with a flavor of romance.

When the cattle men had cleaned up the reservation and closed the Cheyenne the camp was visited one evening by a party from a neighboring ranch, one of whom was a charming young girl from the East, Miss Lettie Barton. She was delighted at the novelty of the scenes at camp, and readily accepted an invitation from Alex. Kenyon, one of the outfit, to take a canter over the bluffs to the river.

They were nearing the bluffs when suddenly a black steer rushed out from a clump of bushes. The horse which the young lady rode took fright, became unmanageable and bounded away toward the river. Kenyon tried in vain to overtake her and grasp the rein of the horse. His horse's best efforts could not bring him near enough to accomplish the feat. As the two horses rushed up the bluff a sheer precipice fringed with treetops appeared a few rods ahead. It looked as if horse and rider were doomed, but Kenyon, who had anticipated the danger, suddenly reined his horse and swung his rope lariat about his head and sent it coiling in the air.

The loop fell about the shoulders of the frightened girl. The cowboy's horse reared back, the rope tightened and the girl was lifted from the saddle and drawn to the heavily tufted prairie sod. The girl, half unconscious, was borne back to camp by her cavalier, who was prouder of his exploit than the cowboy who beat the steer-roping record last year. The riderless horse plunged over the precipice and was killed.

An Interesting Slander Suit.

HALIFAX, July 30.—A writ was issued yesterday by Albert D. Newton, waiter in a Halifax hotel, on R. G. Leckie, manager of the Londonderry iron mines for $5,000 damages—slander and malicious prosecution being charged. Some time ago Newton was arrested on suspicion of stealing $400 from a valise belonging to Leckie while the latter was a guest at Halifax. Leckie afterwards found the money and the waiter was discharged. It is alleged that Leckie mislaid the money himself and that the waiter had nothing whatever to do with it.

[One story respecting this money is that the owner supposed that he threw it into his valise, and when he came to search the valise he could not find it. He suspected the waiter. Some time afterwards, it is alleged, on putting on his slippers the owner found the money in it. He had carefully stuffed it in the toe of the slipper and put the slipper in the valise.

C. P. R. Earnings.

The following is the return of traffic earnings of the Canadian Pacific railway from July 14th to July 21st, 1891:

1891	$384,000
1890	359,000
Increase for 1891	$ 25,000

Earnings of the New Brunswick railway included both years.

CALIFORNIA LAND SHARKS.

Eastern People Induced to Purchase Paper Vineyards.

SAN FRANCISCO, July 21.—A new swindle has taken the place of the Southern California town-site frauds which were worked so successfully on the confiding Eastern public during the recent boom. The latest is the colonies scheme. In several parts of the State colonies have been laid out on paper and floated at the East and in this city. Perhaps the most extensively pushed of these colonies is the one which is alleged to be located in Kern County. Walter J. Raymond of Dayton, O., advertises a most seductive opportunity for obtaining orchards and vineyards in this State at low prices and on easy terms. He offers to sell the land at $75 an acre—$2 down and $1 per week. No expense. No outlay after this is paid. He agrees to cultivate the land free for ten years, giving the buyer half of all profits. The deed is sent by express on receipt of $20. Raymond located his colony in sec. 15, township 135, two miles from the flourishing Town of Tehochapi, four from Caliente, and 40 from the county seat, Bakersfield. The truth of the matter is that the first location given is not in existence, and according to the State railway guide it is 48 miles from Bakersfield to Tehoehapi and 20 miles from Caliente to Tehochapi. From the number of letters received in Kern County concerning this swindle Raymond has evidently secured many dupes. A similar scheme is being worked in this city by a sharper who offers average land at $6 an acre. It is another colony, but located in the heart of the Colorado Desert.