

dependent upon other countries; we know that as we become self-sustaining, a large number of dutiable articles go off the list, articles upon which we collected a revenue. But there takes place something else, as is shown by the history of all countries having a protective tariff, that a certain line of articles manufactured by the poor and underpaid labor of foreign countries, does not come into this country to such an extent as before, in competition with our own fairly paid labor. Then we find, Mr. Speaker, that the consuming power of the people, growing rich under a protective policy, becomes so great and grows so quickly that other articles, such as luxuries, upon which a revenue tariff is placed, are increased in quantity, and the exchequer feels the effect. So that in reference to that calculation, a calculation of a most important character, the hon. gentleman was, at least, unhappy. But I must hurry on, as my intention is to occupy as brief a period as possible in this important debate. Now, the hon. gentleman attacked a protective tariff at one part of his speech, though he wound up by a resolution which virtually proposes to double the rate of protection which exists to-day. But, inconsistent as that gentleman nearly always is, he attacked the policy of protection. While, on the one hand, he asks us to join a country which is enjoying the greatest protection almost of any country in the world, while he asks us to adopt the American tariff, on the other hand, at another period, he said he took pride in stating that he preferred the British system. He has not the courage of his convictions, and the people know it. He is in love with direct taxation, but he dare not avow it openly. However, he has endeavored to get the thin edge of the wedge inserted. He tried on the people at one time, the effect of direct taxation, and he certainly found it not very popular, and, like his old leader, whose presence I am glad to greet in the House to-day, when he came face to face with the steady, thinking people of the country, with the laboring people, he took back his free trade theories and went down on his knees to a protective tariff. But he attacks a protective tariff to-day, although he may take as sudden a change as he did before, at the time of the next general election. He attacks our position on this ground: He says, Why should you seek a foreign market, when you believe in protection; of what value are foreign markets to this country? Is the hon. gentleman playing with the question? Does he not know that his allies in the United States, Messrs. Butterworth and Hitt, are great protectionists, and they are straining every nerve to get possession of this market, and to slaughter their goods here, and to make us hewers of wood and drawers of water, as of old. The hon. gentleman knows it quite well. And, moreover, he knows that the American people have just elected an extreme protectionist party to power in the United States; he knows, too, that no free trade party can get a foothold there, and he knows well the immense efforts they make, by granting subsidies and otherwise, to obtain admission into foreign markets. And more than that, he knows right well how they have succeeded. In the Australian colonies, notwithstanding the mother country's free trade tariff and its lower-price labor, they have gained a foothold there. He knows that British consuls report that in colony after colony of the Empire, American goods are found competing with British goods, and not only American, but German goods also. The hon. gentleman should study the arguments of his opponents and learn, if he is ignorant now as not to know it, that it is the policy of all countries enjoying a protective tariff to secure as much foreign trade as possible as is consistent with their own manufacturing interests and their own labor interests, and they succeed. And so he will find out, if he consults his allies to whom I have already alluded, that you may be a protectionist and yet make an effort to obtain increased foreign trade, and even succeed in obtain-

ing a considerable share of foreign trade. We know well that American and foreign goods have been slaughtered in our market. The hon. gentleman himself admits—I have the reference to his speech here, if he has forgotten it—that during his *regime* goods from American factories were slaughtered in this market. This fact goes to show that this condition of things can occur in a country even though it is enjoying for the time a protective tariff. Protective countries require foreign markets just as the United States, require our market. The manufacturers will sell their goods there at cheaper prices, they will slaughter them there, in order that they may keep their hands employed and be able to await the arrival of better times in their own country. It is too late, either in Canada or on this continent, to go back to first principles and discuss free trade and protection, when there is not a single member in this House, on either side of it, who would stand up and say that he would put his free trade principles into practice.

Mr. GILLMOR. I would.

Mr. TUPPER. And no one would dare to go to the people and say that he intended to raise the revenue of the country in any other way than by indirect taxation. No man yet has had the courage to express such convictions, if they have been convictions. The home market is of great importance. It is not dear to the manufacturer alone, but to the farmer as well. The hon. gentleman has attempted to place in conflict the two great interests of this country, the manufacturing interest and the farming interest. If he has read the doctrines of free traders, he will remember surely that when Mr. Cobden was arguing in favor of free trade in England, and his opponents were arraying those two classes there against each other, his statement was—and we have found it to be true, as the elections have shown in this country—that you cannot help the manufacturer without helping the farmer, since the manufacturer is the farmer's best customer. The home market is more valuable always. Commercial history teaches us that fact in every country. While we desire to secure the foreign market as well, we require a stable home market to enable our manufacturers to furnish employment to their hands, and it is necessary to the success of the farmer as well,—and the farmers understand it thoroughly well. The hon. gentleman affects a love for the British system. If the House will permit me, I will quote a sentence from a recent speech by Mr. Goschen, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer. He is as great a free trader as there is in English politics to-day, and, standing before an audience in Birmingham on Dec. 7th, he told the people there exactly what the income tax was under the British system which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) loves so well. He was proposing to reduce that tax, and, naturally, he desired to show that his measure was deserving of sympathy and support:

"The relief of the income tax was not a relief simply or mainly for the rich. The income tax is a tax that bears with terrible weight on the struggling tradesman, on the professional man, on the clerk who has £300 or £400 a year, on the small farmer who can scarcely make both ends meet. These are the men who are deserving of sympathy, and I protest, not only as Chancellor of the Exchequer, but I protest as a citizen, that it is not this class on which, in the mere impossibility of finding other resources, you should always place the burden of taxation whenever more money is wanted. I thought that the income-taxpayer had a fair claim to be relieved, and that relief has been given, and the income tax, which stood at 8d. in the pound has been reduced to 6d."

The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) tells us to-day that he likes the British system, that he desires to again have the opportunity of imposing direct taxation on the people, of imposing it on struggling tradesmen and small farmers, who, he says, are already suffering from so many burdens. He knows not only that the British system has led to poorly-paid labor to such an extent as has been described, but an examination shows that under the "sweating" system goods are produced at