

urers. Not only was there a law to that effect, but there were provisions by which the ship that carried it was liable to be seized; the captain who signed their bills of lading was subjected to the penalties of both fine and imprisonment. It was a criminal offence to induce a skilled workman to emigrate to a foreign country, where his skill might have the effect of improving foreign manufactures. There was a rigid system of exclusion, almost of absolute prohibition; and under this condition of affairs England, in 1849, was found to be in such a position as to enable her to reverse entirely her former policy and to permit the competition of the world. My hon friend will hardly deny that up to that time such was the commercial policy of England.

Hon Mr GALT—I will only say this, that after the policy of England was made free there was an immense development of her trade and a great improvement in the condition of the people.

Hon Mr ROSE—There can be no question about that, and I am quite prepared to admit it, although other circumstances—such as railways and the increased facilities of transport and of intercourse had much to do with that. Let my position in this matter be not misunderstood. I have never been, nor never will be, an advocate of any policy which shall give to home manufactures that sickly growth which depends solely on legislative protection, or which shall increase to any appreciable degree the cost of any article to the consumer at large; but what I desire to show, and what I hope the House will spare me a few moments in order to impress upon it, is the great circumspection and care which the English statesmen of that day had for the interests that had grown up under the former protective policy, and the gradual, cautious and considerate way in which they were dealt with. They were careful not to abolish at one stroke of the pen, as my honorable friend proposes to do, but gradually and slowly to reduce the protective duties that had previously existed, and under which the manufactures of England had arisen. I shall not, I think, be asking too much if I urge on the House that they follow the same course—to have the same regard for existing interests here, which Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Huskisson, Mr. Gladstone, those eminent statesmen, who were the foremost advocates of free trade, manifested for the interests then existing in England. (Hear, hear.) In introducing his bill of 1842 into the House of Commons, Sir Robert Peel said:

“With respect to *raw material*, which constitute the element of our manufactures, our object, speaking generally, has been to reduce the duties on them to almost a nominal amount. In half manufactured articles, which enter almost as much as the raw material into our domestic

manufacture, we have reduced the duty to a moderate amount, and with regard to completely manufactured articles, our design has been to remove prohibition and to reduce prohibitory duties, so that the manufactures of foreign countries may enter into a fair competition with our own.” (Hear, hear.)

And Mr. Gladstone, in reference to this policy and to the legislation of Parliament from 1842 to 1852, said:

“It was an attempt to make a general approach to the following rules: First, the removal of prohibitions. Secondly, the reduction of duties on manufactured articles, and of protective duties generally, to an average of twenty per cent, *ad valorem*. Thirdly, on partially manufactured articles, to rates not exceeding ten per cent. Fourthly, on raw material, rates not exceeding five per cent.”

Here, then, was laid down a policy which, with a general reduction of duties on manufactures, was essentially discriminatory on behalf of domestic interests; and I will presently show in what particulars my hon. friend (Mr. Galt) has departed from these principles.

Hon. Mr. GALT—-I think if my hon. friend refers to Mr. Gladstone's remarks when discussing the duties on silks, he will find that he did not propose to discriminate in favor of the home manufacture; but I shall be prepared at the proper time to show that my course has not been different from that pursued in England.

Hon. Mr. ROSE—-I think my hon. friend is in error. Here is what Mr. Gladstone said in reference to that very thing.

Hon. Mr. GALT—-When was that?

Hon. Mr. ROSE—-In 1853.

Hon. Mr. GALT—-No, it was in 1863 that he spoke on those duties.

Hon Mr ROSE—Oh, that was at the time of the Treaty, which gave equivalents. My hon. friend knows that it was not till then that the manufacturers had their protection entirely taken off. It was under the Treaty, in virtue of which France said: “If you will take our silks, our wines, etc., we will admit your iron and coal and other articles.” It was a Treaty in which concessions were made by one country, in return for equivalents by the other. With reference to the ribbon manufacturers in Coventry, Mr Gladstone made the following remarks, which I read in order to show with what care and tenderness existing interests were dealt with:—

“In so far as silk is an article into the manufacture of which protection enters, the protection has mainly reference to a certain class of operatives with respect to whom it would be the disposition of Parliament to proceed carefully and with great circumspection.”

Hon. Mr GALT—What is the date of that?

Hon. Mr ROSE—1853.