

ciple of free trade as a great bugbear and declared there was no such thing as free trade in the world. He agreed with the hon. member that there was no such thing as absolute free trade. But the question in this country was not whether we were to have absolute free trade or absolute protection, but whether we were to have a policy of protection engrafted on a policy of modified free trade. The hon. member for West York, in the course of his remarks, had shown a considerable knowledge of a certain period of French history in the time of Louis XIV, and had spoken of the existence of the system of legalized plunder which existed in France. There was, however, a like period in English history, and when next the hon. member read history he should read that from Queen Elizabeth to Charles I. During that time a system of legalised robbery prevailed, and it was under the strongest kind of protection. The hon. member should also remember the kind of protection which existed in England not long ago, when salt was protected to such a great extent. The question the House was called upon to consider was whether the resolution submitted by the Finance Minister should be read the second time, by which the House could be called upon to further burden the people—because after all that was what it amounted to—by increasing the taxation. The hon. the Minister of Finance, in the course of his Budget speech, informed the House that the country would have a deficit, that the revenue would not equal the expenditure. That was information which every hon. member who had watched the affairs of the country and the course of trade must previously have been in possession of. There was no doubt that, in the history of nations, as in the history of individuals, the income of the nation had its vicissitudes as well as the income of individuals. At one period in our history we might have a time when the values of commodities were advancing, and when lands were rising in price. During such a period, which was spoken of as a period of inflation, there were increased imports which necessarily brought a large revenue. It was a matter of great concern and importance, when they found that

Mr. BERTRAM.

the revenue did not equal the expenditure, as to what policy should be pursued in paying off the public indebtedness. The hon. the Minister of Finance had proposed a scheme for raising the necessary amount of money, and that scheme did not commend itself to the right hon. member for Kingston in that he had proposed an amendment. He would not call it a dishonest amendment, but it was an amendment for protection of a certain kind, but it was only very extenuated protection. The right hon. gentleman submitted his amendment in favour of a re-adjustment of the tariff so as to foster the agricultural, mining and manufacture interests. An important industry had been omitted by the right hon. gentleman—the lumber interest—and, if any means could be devised whereby that interest could be assisted or protected, such would be well worthy of the consideration of the House, for it was suffering more than almost any other industry.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was a manufacturing interest.

Mr. BERTRAM said that was true. but he should be glad to know by what tariff arrangement any assistance or protection could be given to it. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Hamilton had been characterized, he might almost say slandered, by the right hon. member for Kingston as being a selfish proposition, for it only asked for assistance to manufacturers. The only difference, however, between the amendments was that the constituency of one hon. member was larger than that of the other, the right hon. gentleman, as the leader of the Opposition party, from the exigencies of his position, being obliged to draw his amendment somewhat broader. Protection, considered as such, was the essence of selfishness. An interest could not be protected without selfishly considering that interest, and giving it something at the expense of somebody else. He was much gratified with the eulogium, passed by the hon. member for South Ontario, on the system which he characterised as one of incidental protection and modified free trade, under which the industries of