

of the profits of manufacturing, they want to take part of the trade, they do not wish Canada to enjoy all the advantages under a system of that kind. That would indeed be a jug-handled protection, with a good deal of the jug and very little of the handle.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have suggested to us, and dwelt upon it with a good deal of energy, that all we have to do is to ask with sufficient persistence from the Imperial government and we will be allowed to send our productions into Great Britain on the most favourable terms, and she will allow us to maintain a protective tariff against her goods. Now, suppose we went over to Great Britain for that purpose; suppose we sent an emissary over there in the person of the hon. member for East York. I presume he would not refuse to undertake the mission, if he could thereby secure a title to his name, and the right to embellish himself with an ermine robe. Suppose he went over there and had an interview with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach. Our envoy would say to him: You are importing into your country a large quantity of tea on which you collect a duty of £19,000,000. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach would say to him: I want to increase my revenue, I want to get a larger amount than £19,000,000. Our envoy would say: There is a duty can be placed on American grain of £12,000,000. Sir Michael would say: Do you wish to introduce your Canadian grain? And our representative would say: Yes, most certainly. Well, Sir Michael would say, if you bring in your Canadian grain, and that is the object you have in view, I cannot get my £12,000,000, because you will supply the market and keep out American grain. If you bring in part Canadian grain I will only have a portion of my revenue, and you will not effect the object which you have in view in bringing in your grain. What would become of the millions of manufactured goods which we send to the United States, if we were to erect a hostile tariff against the grain of the United States and their raw material? That would be an obstacle, because if there is one thing which the British public regards with immense satisfaction, it is the fact that in spite of all the efforts of the Americans, the cheapness of their production and other causes, the British manufacturers are able to send a large amount of goods into the American market. I think that would be an answer to the question. Of course, if we could procure that market it would be most invaluable to us. But these treaties have to be made, and these customs have to be met. The hon. member for York could not make an arrangement with the mother country without she were willing. They have the initiative, and I think this proposal, if made from Canada, would be answered in that way, that they could not afford to burden their people with an extra duty, that they could not allow

the price of bread to be raised to their artisans by the loss of American trade. But, suppose that our emissary was persevering, and said to Mr. Chamberlain: Mr. Chamberlain, I am desirous to conduct a propaganda among your people, I would like to show them—not from sentiment, because sentiment is discarded in this case—that it is to their advantage to receive Canadian grain instead of American grain. Suppose that Mr. Chamberlain asked our representative to address a meeting in Birmingham. I dare say they could collect a large meeting there. Suppose our representative said to them: We propose to you workingmen that you should abandon your tea duty, and that you should use Canadian grain, and should put a duty upon American grain. It will not make much difference in your six-penny loaf. I can imagine that after making such an address to a meeting of workingmen, one of them would stand up and say: What has that got to do with our loaf of bread? Do you propose that we should drink tea all the time, and that we should put a duty on our bread? What are you going to give us in exchange for putting a duty on American grain? Are you going to allow us to take our manufactures into Canada free of duty in return for the free entry of Canadian grain? No, sir, we will go back to our beer, we will not drink any more tea, and we will send our goods to the markets where they will be received on equal terms.

Now, if we had the power to compel other countries to receive our goods, and if we could at the same time enjoy protection upon our articles, we would be a flourishing community, no doubt.

The hon. member for East York went on to say that the duty on sugar coming to this country was too high, and ought to be reduced, that a large sum ought to be taken off the duty on sugar, a million dollars, I think he said. He went on to say: Suppose that we were in power, we would take off the duty. Now, I would like to know how that comports with the policy of the hon. and learned leader of the opposition, a pronounced policy of protection. One hon. gentleman wants to take the duty off sugar, and another advocates a pronounced policy of protection. How would a proposal to take the duty off sugar suit the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), who gave us, the other day, an exhaustive speech on the beet-root sugar question? If our trade with Germany is to be maintained, how can we keep out sugar from Germany?

How do these two agree? The hon. member from East York says that about \$12,000,000 are going to be saved to the consumers of this country, that the whole price of the sugar consumption is going to be saved because these beets are to be grown in Canada. It would be very consoling to the beet-root sugar producers that the German beet-root sugar importation is going to