

in England, were manufacturers, and whoever will read their eloquent speeches will discover that their whole and sole object was to have the factories of England run on full time and at the lowest possible wages; to establish England as the workshop of the world. To accomplish their object it was necessary to obtain all raw materials free of duty, including breadstuffs. Without cheap bread cheap labor could not be had. The repeal of duties on British manufactures did not involve any sacrifice, did not at the time jeopardize the home market. Cheap capital, cheap labor, skill, and experience, protected the British manufacturer then against foreign competition. Circumstances are changing in the most unlooked for manner. The foreigner not only competes with the British manufacturer in foreign markets, but has become a competitor in the British home market, and the British manufacturer is now beginning to call out for protection. British free traders were, and are ardent protectionists, of their own trades. Their national policy is protection for their own manufactures.

FREE TRADE THEORISTS

do a great deal to bewilder the ordinary thinker. They confine their own reading to works written exclusively on one side of the question, and they adhere to the views of that side, and insist upon carrying them into practice in the trade of a country like this, to which they are altogether unsuited. I believe there are men in the Government, who are influenced in this way—visionary men—who, I am sure, have no desire to do the country harm, but, on the contrary, desire to benefit it, but whose minds are fixed in favor of free trade by reading works on that side of the subject,—and a very fascinating side it is—and, although they have no practical knowledge of commercial matters, they insist upon carrying their theories into practice to the serious prejudice of the country. (Cheers.) They insist upon giving free trade to their neighbors, while they have failed to obtain it in return for their own country. Trade, to be of equal advantage to two countries, should be carried on between them on equal terms. Free trade, pure and simple, would mean a reciprocity of trade such as we enjoyed with the United States—an untaxed exchange of commodities. If that cannot be got, the next best thing would be a reciprocity of tariffs, so that the exchange of commodities might be effected upon equal terms. If the cost of commodities in two countries is about the same—and it is so at present in the United States and Canada—then, if one country imposes a higher duty than the other, it taxes the industry of that country more than its own industry is taxed by the other in return. It is obvious, therefore, that the industries of the country which has the lowest tariff are prejudicially taxed by its neighbor.

A PRACTICAL POLICY REQUIRED.

While I should like to continue to be a free trader, I am satisfied that we shall not have free trade with our neighbors—that they will not give it to us. I am, therefore, prepared to throw aside theoretical opinions and to be guided by