

their business—than changes. And the reason that confidence can be put into the business is, in addition to the risks that are inseparable, he has reason expected to a change in such change would be? With what second practical illustration, day order a cargo of sugar from Manila, or coffee from Rio Janeiro, risks of trade from other causes, he would find here, six or twelve of tariff had in the is cost to him, with corresponding increase because the market there at any day by Boston in the inter- have no confidence, which he may em- These repeated y of the country do prevent the expan- could be a waste of e-evident a proposi- could but see with confusion into which he, would, I think, of it, and doubly so of so great a mis- Sir, if that is true in is doubly true in re- The merchant has goods which he im- l, though without a take place; but the upon the permanence his capital in ma- ed only for his manu- them away or dis- ange affects him to a ng extent than even move his machinery resent the capital he pose of carrying of the public interests be a change in the ight to be made with eration and delicacy ally, and with the ence, and caution so uly to affect existing not let me be under- friend for having d to the commercial h he has held since

1858, I do not say that he is now personally to be reproached for altering what he gave others reason to believe would be a permanent system at the time when he proposed it, if he considers that the best interests of the country demand the change. The man who risks the charge of inconsistency by boldly changing his opinion, when he believes it to be for the public good, is entitled to credit rather than to blame. Many men would lack the courage to exposing themselves to that charge and would rather cling to opinions which they might feel were pernicious to the interests of the country. I accord that credit to the Minister of Finance, and am willing to believe he now conscientiously holds that the policy which has been pursued in this country since 1859 and which in adjusting the tariff for revenue purposes gave incidental encouragement to the home manufacturer, ought to be changed. But is the occasion opportune? Have we time to consider with proper deliberation how existing interests are to be affected; and is the system of to-day likely to be more permanent than the one of yesterday? The hon. gentleman will see that the main object of the changes he proposes is to provide \$950,000. He says if it had not been for the extraordinary militia expenditure, which he feels bound to provide for although he may not be actually required to make it, the House would not have been called upon to make good any deficit at all; but being called upon to do so he says he must bring before the House for solution the problem whether we should now adopt the protective system of the United States or the free trade system of Europe.

Hon. Mr. GALT—I think I put two points to the House as those justifying these changes. One was the wants of the Minister of Finance, and the other the altered circumstances of the country in regard to the reciprocity treaty.

Hon. Mr. ROSE—Well, I understood my hon. friend to say the necessity of making any change at all in the tariff was forced upon him solely by the public requirements of the year. I understand him now to have meant that he considered the circumstances of the country were such, in consequence of the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty and other events in the United States, that it was necessary to make a change in the policy heretofore adopted in this country. Now, Sir, I am not going at this moment, nor do I think it necessary, to shew (for that has already been done by abler minds more conversant with the subject—the hon. member for Lambton [Mr. McKenzie])—that the new Corn Law system—the intended tax on foreign agricultural products—will be of little practical advantage to the farmer whether in Upper or Lower Canada. Nor yet do I think it necessary that we should now at this Session decide between the system of free trade and the American system. I think that

what we have to consider in Canada is our own peculiar position, and that that policy should be adopted which is most in the interest of the country, without showing any slavish adherence to the theory of free trade on the one hand, or necessarily adopting the theory of protection on the other. (Hear, hear.) I think that what we have to consider is our own peculiar circumstances—not those of Europe or the United States; and, viewing them fairly, decide what policy is best for the varied interests of Canada, and not pin our faith to, or guide our actions by the mere expressions of free trade and protection—expressions which may be and indeed are very differently understood by many who use them. I have no hesitation in saying that the true policy for any country to pursue is that which shall relieve commerce of all its shackles and restrictions, and which shall best effect a free interchange of its own commodities with those of other countries, without the trammels to which commerce is frequently subjected, either by protection, tariffs, or otherwise. But in this the principle of reciprocity—of mutuality—is everything. (Hear, hear.) If that is what my hon. friend understands by free trade—if the markets of one country are to be freely opened to the producers of another—if he can mature a scheme that will give us the markets of the United States or of foreign countries, then I for one will be quite prepared to support him if he should propose a measure to abolish every custom-house in the country. (Hear, hear.) Let us have free access to the markets of the world, and the people of this country are quite prepared to open theirs. They desire only equality. But my hon. friend has spoken of the European system as that which we should adopt. Now, what is the European system with which he asks us to be enamoured? Is it *practically* a system which permits of the free interchange of the commodities of Europe among the nations of Europe? I am afraid the theory is one thing and the practice another. My hon friend knows that there was no approach, by England, to such free interchange even as a theory till 1820, when, I believe, the first feeble and very limited movement was made in favor of it by the merchants of London. My hon friend knows that from 1820 till 1840 there was but little change in the English customs, and that up to the latter period there were, I think, no less than eleven or twelve hundred rates of duty charged on different articles.

Hon Mr GALT—Which have all since been swept away.

Hon Mr ROSE—Yes; but so stringent had the commercial policy of England been in favour of the domestic manufacturer that for many years it was prohibited to export machinery to foreign countries, lest they should thereby be enabled to enter into competition with her own manufac-