

faulgar, the soldiers who once met the steel of the most famous troops of the world, under the greatest general of modern times, perhaps the greatest general of all times, are now employed in forcing upon helpless barbarians the wares and products of Sheffield and Manchester. It is a slander. There was a time indeed when England, then having a high tariff, found closed against her trade, by the power of Napoleon, the harbours of France, Spain, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and even of a part of Germany. These harbours she opened by the strength of her arms. And the hon. gentleman would tell us now that the great nation whose motto in the modern world seems to have been borrowed from that of the ancient Romans—"Debellare superbos"—must retire before the competition of other nations and use her army and her navy to force an undesired trade upon helpless savages and inferior races. I say that to-day England is armed to fight the hostile tariffs of Europe. She has a weapon more potent by far than the weapons of her most valiant warriors. That weapon is the principle of freedom of trade, which enables her to manufacture at a cheaper rate than any nation in the world, and to overcome all the difficulties that are placed in her way. The hon. gentleman spoke of Prince Bismarck and said that Bismarck, having the choice between the English system and the American system, chose the American system of protection. So he did, and a great service he rendered to his country in doing so! Look at Germany to-day, torn by the factions of Socialism, which is the direct outcome of protection. It is true, I admit, that some industries in England have at times been injured by the hostility of foreign tariffs. But the injury aimed at England redounded with ten-fold force upon the nations which inflicted it. You have spoken of Bismarck. Yes; we have greater Bismarcks and smaller Bismarcks in this world. Prince Bismarck wanted to create for Germany a national industry, a special industry, that of beet-root sugar. He commenced to do what was done by gentlemen opposite—he placed an enormous customs duty on foreign sugar; and, not satisfied with that, he induced the German Parliament to vote considerable export bounties upon German sugar. And thus, one day, the English market was flooded with German sugar, which was sold there at a price lower than the English refiners could produce it for. There was naturally some commotion among the English refiners. They went to see the Government and represented that it was impossible for them to compete with the German refiners, fed as these were by bounties. If the Government in England had been composed of the school of hon. gentlemen opposite they would have said: What! German sugar coming to England! Englishmen are too patriotic to eat German sugar. England for the Englishmen! We will have none of it! But they

said nothing of the kind. On the contrary, they said: Well, if the German Government is willing to tax the German people in order to supply the British people with sugar at a cheaper rate than it can be produced for here, we cannot see that it is a very great injury to the English people. If the Germans are foolish enough to prefer such an arrangement, why should we complain? The refiners were not daunted. They purchased all the German sugar that was in the market, they converted it into jam, into jelly and into preserves, which they sent back to the Germans at an increased profit; and it has been proved that there were more people employed in England in producing jams, jelly and preserves than there had been in refining sugar. The hon. gentleman tells us that he wants neither a revenue tariff nor a free trade policy, but that he wants a protective tariff. Let me again quote his language:

The other and third method is the protective tariff, by which you select a certain list of articles and place upon them certain rates of impost with a view to raising a certain amount of money for the services of the country, but more especially with this view, that whilst you raise the amount of money that is necessary for the country, you shall stimulate the development of the resources of the country, you shall make its industrial life broad and diversified, and progressive.

Sir, this sounds very well, and as a mere assemblage of words it can hardly be excelled. If the object of the hon. gentleman is to develop the industries of the country by a policy which will give favour to no one and which will hinder no one, I am with him with all my heart, but that is not the policy of the hon. gentleman. He wants to develop the industries of the country, but in what way? By increasing the cost of commodities, by compelling the people to purchase at a higher price at home than they could obtain the same goods elsewhere. Well, I admit that with such a system he might develop special industries, but I assert that he will stifle the growth of the country. What has been the experience of our north-west country? Surely no one will pretend that Manitoba and the North-west Territories have realized that amount of prosperity which was expected for them at one time. It was expected that in the year 1894 Manitoba and the North-west Territories would have a population of 600,000 souls at least, and you know what a beggarly number were found there at the last census. More than that, you have developed the east at the expense of the west. Why is it that the growth of that country has been stunted? It is simply because in order to favour certain industries in the east you have prevented the people in that country from acquiring their goods at as cheap a rate as they could get them under a freer system of trade. But there is another objection to the system of the