

as we pay them ourselves, there could be nothing advanced in favor of the tariff."

Those, I think, are very sound words.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Whose views are those?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Sir David Macpherson's.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Not the Minister of the Interior, surely!

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The present Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman from Toronto, Mr. Allan, on the same occasion said:—

"He had no desire to see the doctrine of protection revived in Canada, and more duties imposed than were absolutely necessary for the purposes of revenue. He objected to the policy because it would not answer the purpose its promoters claimed for it. He spoke of the great injury that would be done to the shipping and commercial interests of the country.

"He believed the measure was in itself inaugurating a mischievous system of legislation."

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It shows that the logic of facts has changed those gentlemen's minds.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have also the views of some gentlemen of Nova Scotia, which are equally strong, as well as more forcible and eloquent. I have given the opinions of several prominent individuals. I could go on and give a number more. I could give also the opinions of leading manufacturers of the United States, because they, like the manufacturers of England in 1830, and later on, have come to the conclusion that even they are not benefited by protective duties. They are learning that very much to their cost. We are getting a line of experience in Canada which indicates that the wage earners of the country are being taxed professedly for their benefit, but that even they are injured by the imposition. The Finance Minister, when he makes his Budget Speech, says that a tax, whether levied on one article or another, produces revenue—that if he does not tax cotton wool, sugar, and other things which enter into manufactures, he will have to raise revenue from other articles of consump-

tion. When people pay duties on articles of consumption, like tea, the money goes into the revenue of the country. He does not inform them, however, that when he puts a duty on articles which enter into the manufactures of the country, not only is a revenue derived from them by the Government, but the people are compelled to contribute to the building up of factories for the advancement of factory men and manufacturers, and the result of it is to produce a spasm in trade, and so much competition in some lines that over-production, inflation, bankruptcy and ruin, and all the regular train of results which naturally flow from the cause, are witnessed in the country. The result is that while the revenue is being maintained by taxation, a large portion of the money that the people are compelled to pay does not go into the revenue, but goes temporarily to assist men who are ultimately injured by it. It proves to be an utter failure in its results in a great many cases. As a consequence, the money of the country becomes exhausted, circulation decreases, and results follow which are usually witnessed in all very highly protected countries, and to some extent in all countries, through changes in the nature of trade; so that the expression of opinion from a manufacturer—I do not refer to the opinions expressed by Mr. Hewitt, and others in Congress last year, though they were very pronounced, but another gentleman, whose expressions are of very recent date—will be interesting. Mr. Hewitt is a manufacturer, and he thought the trade policy was a mistake, and would be very glad to inaugurate a very different one; and it is necessary that I should make some reference to American authorities, because I understood some speakers to say that they were a unit there.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—My belief is that if a poll were taken on the question in the United States, the majority of the people would adopt free trade as far as their circumstances would permit.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I will now quote from a report of a speech recently delivered in Detroit:—

HON. MR. McCLELAN.