

an address delivered by the great unionist leader in England on the 1st of April, 1895, when addressing a manufacturing club representing one of the largest associations in the mother country, he referred to this question. I think the words used are alone a sufficient rebuke and a sufficient reply to all those absurd claims put forward from time to time on the other side of the House as to the attitude of England on this question. Addressing the Birmingham Jewelers' and Silversmiths' Association, Mr. A. Chamberlain said—this is from the London "Times":

I find that there are a number of people who, under the present condition of trade, are coming to the conclusion that our free trade policy has been a failure, and who would, therefore, be ready to go back in the direction of protection. This opinion is not to be treated lightly. It ought to be carefully considered.

I noticed, a very few days after the report of this speech appeared in the London "Times," that that portion of the speech was quoted by the Montreal "Gazette" with a great deal of gusto, while the concluding portion, containing the words which follow, was studiously omitted. He went on to say:

I will only lay before you two reasons why I differ from those who desire to abandon it. My first reason is this: In times past in this country, when England was under protection, and in foreign countries to-day which are also under protection, notably in the United States and in France, trade is even worse than it is here.

And he might have added, Canada.

My second reason is a little more complicated, but I think I can make it clear to you. We cannot maintain by ourselves, by our own efforts alone, the vast population that is crowded within the limits of our territory. We depend upon our foreign trade. But if by any means, by protection or any other, you shut the door upon foreign goods, you may be quite certain that the result will be that there will be fewer English goods that will go abroad.

This is sound doctrine, and it should be taken to heart by every student of political economy in the Dominion of Canada. He went on:

Bear in mind that depression in trade is not a new thing in this country. We have had depression in trade very great and extending over very long periods, at different times in our history. Why, the other day I was reading a most interesting work entitled "A Social History of England," and I happened to come across a description of the state of things in the reign of Henry the VIII.; and the complaints made at that time of the state of trade and the social conditions which were brought about by the depression of trade, might be made at the present moment by any one of us.

That is very close to the halcyon period referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and looked back upon with feelings of pain and regret by the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Mon-

tague). After describing that period, Mr. Chamberlain goes on to say:

Here is the point I want to put to you. In the time of Henry VIII., when people were complaining of the crowded population and want of employment, how many people do you think then were in England? Less than 4 millions. Now, with 30 millions in the same territory, after all, our condition is better than it was then, and the reason is mainly owing to the fact that in the interval our foreign trade has reached such enormous development. Therefore, I say that clearly the policy and duty of this country, the necessity for this country, is to take every opportunity of extending and developing that foreign trade, and especially of securing new markets, which are also free markets, for the introduction of our goods.

The state of agriculture in England has been put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite as one of the causes for a growth, or pretended growth, of the protectionist sentiment in England. Now, there are some 36,000,000 people in the British islands, and it would be only fair to assume, if the agricultural industry is depressed that there would be some, and perhaps very intelligent men, who would look to protection as a remedy; but no political leader or economical leader, no great writer or thinker, can be quoted as favouring this policy, even to assist the distressed agricultural element in the mother country. Mr. Goschen, the Ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, a Conservative and a man of great financial ability, is reported in the "Times" of 20th April, as having referred to the condition of things in England, in these terms:

The propertied classes, who are they? Thank God, the times are past when property belonged to a small portion of the community. Why, the working classes have become capitalists, to a certain extent, and £121,000,000 are in the savings banks, representing the thrift and the accumulated savings of the working classes. Do I speak simply of savings banks? No, in friendly societies, in building societies, in a vast number of other forms. I am glad to say that the working classes have shown that they are able to take their position side by side with capital in promoting trade and industry. I would like to ask those who view with disfavour anything having relation to capital, what they think of the foreign trade of the country, which could not be conducted, as it is now, with that smoothness which brings to our shores food in plenty and the material for our industries, without capital?

Take the agricultural interests alone. I hold in my hands the "Times" report of the council meeting of the Central and Associated Chambers of Agriculture—a body representing all the agricultural interests of England, containing members of Parliament and men eminent in agriculture and in legislation concerning agriculture. After a long sitting and the hearing of an elaborate and voluminous report of the committee appointed to consider the causes of depression in agriculture, the council came to certain conclusions. No less than twelve or thirteen points were laid down and carefully considered by