

but my hon. friend was cautious not to place himself in a position where it would be impossible to retract, provided that it should be found he had gone too far. But that proposition was followed up by other hon. gentlemen who spoke with more authority. It would not be fair to judge of a party platform by the utterances of any of that party's supporters alone. I am aware that supporters of every party differed in their views with regard to these things. Some gentlemen on both sides of the House told them that the issue between parties was a question of Free Trade or Protection, and others that it was not a question of Free Trade or Protection.

The Corner Stone laid by the Premier.

One would not be justified in fixing the responsibility of any set of views upon a party based upon the utterances of any individual supporters of that party, however high they might stand in the party's ranks. I find the Hon. the Premier, however, making use of these words, and they may be accepted as authoritative:—

"The mere passage of an Act of Parliament would never establish any trade and would never foster any industry unless it were to change from one pocket to another the proceeds of the industries of the country. If a particular trade or industry were to be fostered, it could only be done at the sacrifice of some other trade or industry. There was no theory more consonant with the dark ages of the world than that which Protection afforded."

Now, this was a cardinal principle of Free Trade; it was the essential principle of Free Trade. It proceeded upon the assumption that if protection is given to any industry, it is necessarily done at the expense of some other industry of the country, and consequently that protection must be wrong,—wrong in its very essence, for the country must be injured by it. What did this doctrine do? Preached among the people, it made them believe that every industry in the country was the enemy of every other industry; it taught them to be jealous of the growth of every industry, except the particular one in which they themselves were engaged. The Opposition, on the other hand, believe in the sisterhood of these great industries, they believe that these industries are all of the same family, co-workers, independently, yet inter-dependently working out the prosperity of the country. They do not believe in the principle that because one industry prospers, it does so necessarily by fattening on another industry; or that the growth of one, involves the destruction of another. Here is a point upon which these hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, and those who do not concur in their views differ essentially. Here is the very point where the roads diverge. The Opposition believe that the promotion of one industry, betters another.

Benjamin Franklin's Opinion.

When shrewd old Dr. Benjamin Franklin was in England, when his country was new; when he was concerned with regard to its future; and when he sought information and was endeavoring to draw wisdom from abroad, which should conduce to the prosperity

his young interests, following of the bel in their b

"Every visions with be exported

He v

"Here is establishe neighboring produce of t to that part owners of la imported an

Dr F

was in pu from his patriotica precisely that I ha

7

Whe or indus expense which

by argum

me if, i

if I decla

that in E

of what

industries

with all

Governm

many i

fostered

it was r

dustry v

or of tl

of that

—the fa

Premier's

the foster

and in co

prospered

commere

is equally

ever don