

States. I will invite my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) to fight this matter out with the Finance Minister. With respect to this subject both political parties have met with some disappointments. We have been hopeful at times, afterwards we have been depressed, but I have no hesitation in subscribing to this, that there is not on the political horizon, and has not been for the last fifteen years, any very strong indications that reciprocity was a boon likely to be granted to Canada for anything she could give in return, anything she could fairly and advantageously give. And although the statesmen of both parties have tried and have had hopes, and have put those hopes along the line of action, yet it has been in every case to meet with disappointment. The disappointment of hon. gentlemen opposite who made the pilgrimage to Washington a little while ago, is I think, just as keen as was the disappointment of some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who made former visits to Washington on the same business.

But the hon. gentleman's great argument was that there had not been an increase in our population. He showed that the National Policy had been discredited and proved a failure, because when it was supposed that our industries would employ labour, our people had nevertheless left, and our immigration had not been as large as had been confidently expected. I want to put the obverse. Suppose there had not been the National Policy and none of the industries and employment furnished from 1867 to the present time, would we have got as large immigration, and would we have retained as many of our people as we have retained? People do not leave this country because it is not a free country, because the climate is not good and the soil productive, because its institutions are not excellent, or because of any disability in the country naturally, but when men leave this Dominion and go to the United States they go to seek employment or a wider life in some respect than they can secure here. Reduce the employment offered, and would there be a less number of people going to other countries? And the hon. gentleman's argument is not fair when he says he is disappointed with respect to increase in population and the tide of immigration, and that these are due to the National Policy. That is a perfect non sequitur, an argument which is without logic. It may be that certain things happen, that many other things happen, but it takes logic to make one apply to the other in the relation of cause and effect, and the hon. gentleman has failed to do that.

But the hon. gentleman indulged in another reminiscence, and that was about the good old way—when a man established himself at cross-roads, people came to his shop, when he had sons they joined him in the business, the people had confidence in his

work, his business increased, and he lived and prospered without a bonus. The hon. gentleman regretted that that is not the method to-day. The hon. gentleman may deplore this fact, but he may rest assured that he will never bring back the old cross-road methods of manufacturing. In Germany, France and England, where there are free trade, protection and revenue tariffs, you will find the old method of business going out of date, and combinations of capitalists prevailing, under which labour is divided into departments so as to insure cheapness in the manufactured product.

That is the tendency of to-day. Free trade does not change it; protection does not change it. Take any basis you like and frame a tariff in a country, and you will never bring back the old cross-road methods of doing manufacturing business. To-day we have changed conditions, and we have to suit ourselves to these changed conditions. But, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) went on to prove that there was protection enough without protection. Now, I do not wonder that his free trade friends yonder should feel a little sore because protection has been kept. Why is it kept? Why do you want 35 per cent on anything, when the Finance Minister told you yesterday that there was sufficient protection in Canada in three things: First, the convenient market, second, the cost and charges of transport, and third, patriotism. Well, Sir, that leads me to remark on the first of these, that convenience has not the same meaning now that it had 25 years ago. The range is very widely spread. To-day it is a fact, that you can send products a thousand miles and land it for less money than you can send it for 200 miles from the interior of the country. Can we change all those conditions? We have not changed them, and so the argument of convenience does not amount to so much as at first sight it would seem. Neither does the argument with reference to transport, which is about the same. Nay more, does not my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) know, that if he attempts to ship a cargo of something, we will say from the western part of Ontario and bring it to Toronto, that he will pay more for the carriage of it than his competitor in Chicago will pay for having it brought from Chicago to Toronto? Can he change all these things? Is he trying to change them? He must change them before his argument on transport amounts to much. But what does transport and convenience both amount to, when you are putting the raw muscle upon the raw material, and making it into the manufactured article, and sending it a thousand miles or two thousand miles across the ocean to market, if you pay one-half for the amount of labour there that you have got to pay to the yeomen labourers of this country. What does it amount to? It amounts to naught,