

Here was the case of an *exotic* industry planted in protection, created and maintained and preserved by protection, which had become, on the admission of a recognized free-trade authority, a well established leading industrial pursuit. I think the House may consider this a pretty fair refutation of the assertion that one trade is necessarily fostered at the expense of some other trade. Indeed we need not go so far as France to find other evidences. We have had evidences in our own country :

#### Boot and Shoe Manufactures—a Refutation.

We have the boot and shoe industry, which was one of the industries favored by a larger amount of protection than any other industry at that time, except one, I believe, and the object of this high protection was to create this industry and give it a foothold in Canada. What has been the result? This—that we now have a boot and shoe industry of great importance in Canada as the result of that protective measure. An industry of great magnitude and great usefulness has thus grown up in this country, under and as the direct result, of protection. It has grown to such dimensions, that, according to the statement of the hon. member for North York, and also to the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk the other evening, boots and shoes are now made in Canada to such an extent that Canada, in this respect, controls her own market, and fears no competition from abroad. True, it was said that a few were brought in, but these were kinds that are not manufactured or much required in this country. Here was an industry that had been planted in protection. It had grown up in protection, and it had succeeded, through protection. I ask any practical man in this House—and they all knew something about leather, as they all wear boots and shoes—if any gentlemen could claim that this industry has been built up at the expense of any other industry in this country? Is it not true that boots and shoes are as cheap in this country as could be reasonably asked? We are told that if protection was entirely removed—if we had Free Trade in this matter—our manufacture is of such excellence, and such cheapness, that it would not be injured by the free importation of American boots and shoes. Then, if that were the fact, this result had not been injurious to the community; but, on the contrary, had it not been beneficial? Had it not done another thing, besides cheapening the price? Were not other industries created by it? Look at the manufacture of leather. The tanning of leather has grown up side by side with it, as a sister industry, and what did this involve? It involved a benefit to the farmer; it involved the purchase of an article that is only marketable and only has a value for tanning purposes, that is the bark that grows on the hemlock tree. It furnishes the farmer with a market for his hides; it furnishes work for a large number of men, and profitable employment for capital. The boot and shoe business and also furnishes employment for many persons. Will any gentleman in this House, then, assert that the

protective  
has not be  
person in  
not dwell  
clear that  
of the free

The I

But, v  
that policy  
It is in  
the Premie  
period of  
Minister of  
taxed. I w  
policy of thi  
ing millions  
payers of thi  
upon the pe  
of Canadian  
ing trade of  
all the pul  
more effecti  
himself. No  
attain by it  
foster and p  
and by artifi  
United Stat  
commerce m  
policy of pro  
that is not  
taxation mea  
not enrich th  
a heavy sin t  
of their pool  
the nation  
to the grea  
sistently or  
this House.  
our piers awa  
ing and prote  
protection to  
the fishing inc  
country is ess  
then we have  
do we exempt  
ture of ships  
protect this  
effectively by