

National Policy. Indeed, I believe, and have good reason to believe, that there are men there to-day who were better off, and made more money, and were in more comfortable circumstances financially, under the operation of the tariff of the Mackenzie Administration than they are to-day under the tariff of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury Benches. I am satisfied they had greater prosperity. You may have a few more factories, but what is the fact? If the National Policy tends to do anything at all it tends to build up and then break down—to encourage more factories than are necessary. The Finance Minister extends his liberty and kindness in the direction of protecting those who are disposed to enter into manufacturing business, and the result is that more factories are erected than can find consumers for their produce and the end is that there comes disaster. Well, Sir, it does not matter what particular state of things exists hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to clap their hands. When the manufacturers are now in deep water they say, "Did not we tell you what would come; did not we tell you that when new factories were erected competition would arise and the people would get their goods far cheaper. To-day there are hundreds of factories in financial difficulties. I know of factories which were in existence and did a creditable and lucrative business before the introduction of the National Policy, and to-day, I am sorry to say, they are closed—they are not able to turn out a single implement, simply because the production in the particular line in which they were engaged has been far more than the country required. The great evil has been that they did not get consumers for the goods they produced. The Government has cast around us a protective policy and we have not the people to take the article manufactured under that policy, and the result is that in many cases they have a larger production than is necessary, and the consequence is stagnation and ruin. The hon. gentleman also said that the price does not keep the goods out of the country; that notwithstanding the National Policy we have still a large influx of goods. That is true; and I ask the House to notice that we are paying an increased price on all those articles we are bringing into the country, in order to satisfy and encourage the owners of those factories in their erection and operation. People have imported goods and paid the increased duties imposed on them in order to encourage the erection of factories to manufacture these goods. Notwithstanding that fact they have not reduced the price, because in some cases they have not produced a sufficient quantity, and the people are driven to foreign markets to supply themselves, and the result is that they are paying an extra price for their goods. Now, Sir, I was surprised at the remarks which dropped from the hon. gentleman with regard to cheese. He said before he sat down he wished to draw the attention of the House to one particular thing, and that thing was cheese, and if there was anything in the world to show the benefits and the advantages of the National Policy it was the article of cheese. Well, Sir, I cannot understand how he draws the conclusion that the National Policy has been the means of establishing so many cheese factories in this country. Does he pretend to say that this country would be flooded with cheese from the United States if we had not a protective policy? Does he mean to say that our people would not have gone into the manufacture of cheese, or that cheese would not have been manufactured in this country, if we had not had the National Policy? Why, Sir, the National Policy has no more to do with the increase in the manufacture of cheese, or with fixing the price of cheese, than it has with arranging the hour when the sun rises or sets each day.

An hon. MEMBER. The duty is just the same as it was.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, the duty now is just what it was, so that the National Policy has nothing to do with it. But the hon. gentleman appears to be convinced that the National Policy really has done wonders for cheese. Well, Sir, I do not know, but my impression is that if he went to the country and addressed a rural audience, and told them they should thank with all their heart and soul the goodness and kindness of the present Government in so encouraging the manufacture of cheese by the introduction of the National Policy, I should think if there was any snow around he would be snowballed, for the people would not stand such nonsense; they know better. We are face to face with two policies. In the first place the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is a policy of protection. Their policy is to protect our factories first, and never mind whether the tariff levied on the people is sufficient to raise a sum necessary to meet the demands of the treasury or not; that is a secondary consideration. We claim that our policy is this: Tax the people to the extent necessary to meet the demands on the Dominion Treasury, and no more. If those who want to manufacture goods within the Dominion are able to manufacture within those limits, we say to them with all our hearts, God speed. But we say on the other hand, if we have in the first place to sacrifice the rights of every consumer in this country, if we have to impose on him a duty which he should not be asked to pay, if we have to extract from his pocket annually a certain sum in order to encourage a certain individual to manufacture a certain thing—we say then, in justice to the country, in justice to the individual, it is wrong. It is wrong that any country should base its annual levy for the purpose of meeting the demands on the Treasury, from any such point of view. I say that a revenue tariff, properly and honestly administered, is amply sufficient for the purpose of encouraging the manufacture of any goods within this Dominion that can be successfully manufactured here. Now, Sir, the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff I think I have fully explained; and I hold that if those who are disposed to manufacture were permitted to import the raw material free, and were granted the privilege and the protection our tariff would necessarily give them, it is all the protection they should ask, and all they should receive. Now, I made a special note of the remark of the Finance Minister on the cotton trade. He took the opportunity of comparing the prices of cotton on the American side with those now manufactured in Canada. He mentioned certain brands manufactured in the United States and certain brands manufactured in Canada, and he said the prices are about the same. Now, Sir, he should have told us something along with that. He should have told us that in the United States at this moment not a single bale of cotton leaves a factory that is not sold under a combination. There is not a single mill in the United States at this moment that has not entered into an arrangement whereby every bale it turns out is placed under the control of and sold by one man. I know that. Now, in the face of that fact, what is our position to-day when the Finance Minister tells us that we are now paying a price for cotton equal to the price paid under a combination in the United States? What is going to be the price here when we have a combination? What does the hon. gentleman say? He says to us: I have no hesitation in saying that there is not a member in this House, there is not at least a supporter of the National Policy, who is not prepared to say that he would be glad to see such an arrangement made as would secure to the investors in this country a fair return for the money they have invested, as well as a fair return for the article produced. That is his statement. Well, what will be the result of that? The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that we have more cotton mills in the country at present than can find