

not the application of this principle to the intricate details connected with a tariff. These must be governed by the varying circumstances of the two countries. The principle of the tariff in the mother country is the principle of a revenue tariff.

Referring to that, and referring to the admitted fact that agriculture in the mother country is to a large degree depressed; all the opponents of the revenue tariff dwell with great gusto and infinite humour upon the condition of the agricultural classes in the old country. They upbraid England for her ignorance of political economy and for her stupidity in not seeing the way to true wealth and true grandeur by adopting the policy advocated by Canadian Conservatives. I will not pause, Mr. Speaker, to point out the effect upon this country if the statesmen of Great Britain listened with any idea of following the advice of these gentlemen, because we all know what that would result in as regards the producers in this country. But, dwelling upon the distress in agriculture in the mother country, and upon her adherence to the principles of a revenue tariff, they are never weary of intimating—although they are careful never to give the figures—that Great Britain is declining, that she is weakening financially, that she is losing her power, her force and her influence in the world, by adhering to this revenue policy. What an utter absurdity, in the face of the trade and financial returns of the motherland! Look abroad at the protected countries of the world in this year of grace 1895, and you will see every one of them with enormous deficits in their national exchequers: France, Germany, the United States, and Canada—all of them struggling with financial difficulty, owing to the embarrassments brought about among their people, and in their revenue resources, in consequence of the restrictive tariffs which they support, and which they pretend to enjoy. But go to free trade England, and there you find the Chancellor of the Exchequer in this very year announcing a substantial surplus with which to carry on the services of the country.

Coming back to the speech made by the hon. Minister of Justice, I think no one in this House and no one who read it in the country, could have been otherwise than amazed that one enjoying a proud distinction received from his Sovereign, should have descended to use the language which he did in regard to the mother country. He said:

We are considering the Great Britain of 1894, but he (Mr. Davies) gave us statistics of Great Britain in 1886, and the hon. gentlemen themselves scorn and deride all suggestions that her foreign trade was being interfered with. Let him read a statement from the speech of any public man, Liberal or Conservative, in the motherland to-day, who will say for one moment, that the hostile tariffs surrounding that country in every quarter of the globe have not been successful in forcing her out step by step

Mr. FLINT.

from the position of vantage which she once had in the various markets of the world. What is the whole policy of the motherland to-day?

And here is a sentence which I commend to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, especially to those loyalists among them who profess to be the only citizens who are true to the red cross flag:

Driven from the civilized markets of the world steadily, and every year finding their output to those markets decreasing, they spend millions on their navy and millions on their army to force their wares and their goods and their merchandise into the uncivilized markets of the world, which they are endeavouring to occupy, to settle and to control, driven there by the deadly effect upon them of the tremendous competition coming from the protectionist nations in the rest of the world.

I was proud when our eloquent leader, although belonging, by birth, to another race, on the spot rebuked this foul slander on the people of the mother country. "Driven from the civilized markets of the world, Great Britain is spending millions on her army and her navy to force her merchandise on the uncivilized nations of the world."—was ever a fouler slander uttered against Great Britain than that contained in these words? It is not only unpatriotic, but it is manifestly untrue. In every market of the world where England controls, every nation has the same privilege as the mother country. She sets up no protectionist barrier in favour of her own merchants and her own manufacturers. She may civilize those countries and give them sound, healthy government; but as soon as she sets up her own administration, she says to all the world: "Come in and compete with us in a fair, free, and open market." Hon. gentlemen opposite can point to no instance in the whole history of the mother country where she has forced her trade on any civilized or uncivilized nation by means of her army and navy. The soldiers and sailors of England have a nobler work than that to perform. They have a work to perform under the aegis of the British flag, of giving good government, wholesome and equal laws and equal privileges, to all the people who choose to live or trade under the protection of that flag. What has been the result of the free trade policy of Great Britain upon her finances at home, and upon the prosperity of her people? Hon. gentlemen quote isolated cases, from agricultural reports, and other sources, of individuals here and there who advocate protection on grain and other agricultural products as a possible relief or remedy against agricultural distress in Great Britain; but they are not able, and never have been able, and I challenge them to-day, to quote from one leading public man, Conservative or Liberal, in the mother country, who has any responsibility resting upon him, one line or syllable in favour of the adoption of a protective tariff for Great Britain. I hold in my hand extracts from