

English people are living in a fool's paradise who believe that the result of the recent democratic victory in this country, although based on the cry of tariff reform, will result in any measure that will open the markets of the United States to the manufactured goods of England or the Continent of Europe.

He was a true prophet as has been proved not only by the Wilson Bill itself, but as has been proved by the revision of that bill in the Senate. Then he goes on to say:—

There is no American statesman living who dare precipitate such a national economic crisis. It would not be reform—it would be revolution. I am, as you know, a convinced free trader. Protection is to me an economical heresy, the fraud and folly of which are capable of mathematical demonstration—demonstration as absolutely convincing as that by which the solution of a problem in Euclid is arrived at. And yet throughout the length and breadth of this vast continent one is almost daily brought face to face with solid indisputable facts that seem to give the lie to the soundest and most universally accepted axioms of political economy. Let me give you just one example. Under the shadow of a stringent protective tariff, the manufacture of paper was commenced in the United States. Paper is still subject to a heavy import duty. According to our theories, that ought to enhance its price to the consumer in this country. As a matter of fact, the New York newspaper proprietors buy their "news" at a less price than that at which it could be supplied to them in London, and some of the paper mills in New Jersey are actually exporting paper to the old country. Unless it can be shown that this paper industry would have grown up without the aid of a protective tariff, it is futile—nay, it is an impertinence—for an outsider to say that the Americans have acted unwisely in taxing themselves for a few years in order to establish in their midst a great industry giving occupation to a great quantity of highly paid labour. And it seems to me that this set of facts and the arguments based on it apply to many of the other industries which are assuming such colossal proportions throughout the length and breadth of the land.

There is the evidence of a confirmed free trader of England showing the beneficial effects of a protective tariff in the United States. If this Mr. Carr had travelled further and inquired more into the effects and results of the protective tariff in the United States, he could have applied the same remark to hundreds of other things that they have succeeded in producing under that protective tariff as cheaply as they do in the older countries, and are actually exporting to that free trade country which we all admire so much. Although a free trade policy may be right in the abstract to a great extent in England, it would be destructive in a new country like Canada.

I have but a few words to say with reference to my hon friend's remarks on the question of trade and cable communication with Australasia. I was pleased to hear his remarks on what was the result of the Behring Sea arbitration, because he viewed that question, to my mind, from a broad statesmanlike standpoint so different from that in which it was dealt with by his own leader in another branch of the legislature and the opposition press of the country. I readily admit with him that we did not, as Canadians, get all that we should have liked to obtain, but there is this cause for satisfaction—and I am only reiterating what the hon. gentleman said—that every constitutional issue that was raised, every point that was taken by our Minister of Marine and by our Minister of Justice, the leader of the Government, and by the Government of Canada in reference to the rights of this country and of the world generally in Behring Sea, were sustained by that arbitration, and if there is anything wrong it may be through too strict regulations. Both of the representatives of the United States, and the arbitrator for Canada, who was acting on behalf of the British Government, refused to sign them—so that taking the old adage, when nobody is pleased it must be right—when neither the United States nor Canada was pleased with the proposed regulations they were as near right as foreigners at least could make them. It has been said that it will ruin our industry. I have it from a British Columbian that he has already sent out two or three vessels this year, and that as large a fleet has gone into that business this year as last year. My hon. friend shakes his head—perhaps he knows better than I do. I am giving this statement, not on my own authority but on what I conceive to be good authority—that is, those who are engaged in the trade themselves. My hon. friend, spoke very pleasantly about my trip to Australia and the manner in which the Canadian representative was received—I can only say to him that he did not exaggerate that reception. I did not accept that as a tribute to myself, because if my hon. friend or any one else had gone as representing Canada, he would have received the same attention. Greater warmth of feeling and a greater desire to discuss the object of that mission, and a more earnest interest taken in the building up of a trade between the colonies to bring