

employment of every arrow in the quiver of protectionists. He is bound to do that. He is bound to make that suggestion to the empire when he goes over there; he is bound to say it has succeeded in Canada, that it has succeeded in the United States, that it has succeeded in Australia—because they are going in for it there. There is no other way of unifying the empire, of binding it together, of promoting trade between the different sections of the empire, than by adopting a system of protection, or some system which will preserve the empire from exploitation by outside and hostile nations.

Now this principle of protection, which I say is just as good for the whole empire as it is for Canada, what is it based on? What is the difference between it and the principle of free trade? Free traders have always said that their principle was based on the brotherhood of man, they have always been preaching that. Well, it is not the brotherhood of man that rules to-day among nations, it is the law governing the struggle for existence that rules. Englishmen have been misled. For years and years they have been talking about the brotherhood of man, and now they are up against a struggle for existence. Other nations do not reciprocate. When England has opened up her markets to all these hostile nations, they have not shown any brotherhood, but they have exploited England. So that, the brotherhood of man is not a safe principle to go by and we must recognize the other principle that national life is a struggle for existence; therefore, each nation must take care of itself. Those who have favoured this free trade argument have also said that the least government is best. The contrary is true and with the growth of civilization the responsibilities and duties of government increase. Leave trade alone? No. As civilization increases the responsibilities of government increase, and you must do more and more for your country and not leave trade alone. The law with all these nations is a law of enlightened selfishness and that law must govern the empire, if the empire is to hold its own. The empire must find means of adopting an imperial policy on the lines which have been adopted in this country. The best proof of that system is that in the United States, where protection has been adopted, and where it has been carried out to the largest extent, it has resulted in two things. It has cheapened production and it has built up the country in a way that enables it to antagonize every other country in the world. If that is so, surely the time has come when the empire must adopt the protective system. A great result will follow from the adoption of the protective principle by the empire, and what is it? The moment the empire adopts the principle of protection and encourages trade between the different sections of the empire, that moment will the empire be treated better by these hostile nations. I do not say

Mr. MACLEAN.

that we can teach the Americans a lesson by giving them a reciprocity of tariffs, but I believe they will learn something if some such treatment is accorded to them, and the first thing you will see is, that the moment the American nation finds the English market refused to it and a preference given to Canadian products, it will treat the British Empire in a very different way. You give the Canadian farmer a preference in the English market and keep out the American farmer, and the latter will assuredly do all he can to check the tail twister of the Eastern States. The Americans will change their whole attitude to the motherland and the empire. The moment a protective system is adopted from one end of the empire to the other, we will see the attitude of the Americans towards the motherland and towards this country greatly changed, and changed in the interest of the empire and of Canada. If that is the case, if the government of to-day is actually carrying out the principle of protection, if the attention of the country is called in the Speech from the Throne to the fact that the Prime Minister has been asked to go over to the motherland to take part in the coronation ceremonies and offer suggestions there, the Prime Minister is bound, when he goes over this coming summer, to say that the reason why Canada to-day is prosperous, as we have been told it is prosperous, is because we have adopted a national system of protection, that we are succeeding in it, that the United States has succeeded in carrying out that same principle, and that the empire will succeed if that principle is adopted for the empire. That is his mission, that is the duty before him when he goes over this summer. Will he discharge that duty? I say that he is bound to discharge that duty in the light of the statements made here this afternoon. This country, which is protectionist, this country, which resorts to customs duties, which gives a bonus on production and which proposes reciprocal treatment—

Mr. HOLMES. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. An hon. gentleman says no. I heard of a minister in the present government who said that the time had come when we will have to have reciprocity in treatment and reciprocity in tariffs, and we were told that there were to be no more missions to Washington. If this country is prosperous, as they say it is, and it is prosperous by reason of the principle of protection, then the Prime Minister is bound when he goes to England to advocate the adoption of the principle of protection and all that it involves to the empire at large. If that is done, the empire is bound to adopt a tariff for the empire, to have preferential trade between the different sections of the empire and a reciprocity of tariffs as between the empire and outside hostile nations. Then will the empire grow together and resume its old time leadership of the world. There