

with a recital of the hon. gentleman's speech, but will submit an analysis of its main propositions in their consecutive order. I aim at perfect fairness, and beg the hon. gentleman to correct me if I make a misstatement. This reference to the speech is not made for the purpose of placing my hon. friend at any disadvantage, or because he has since changed his opinions; but because it is the most careful, the best considered, the most clear and concise statement of the views now held by the Opposition, that has yet been given on this much debated subject. The hon. gentleman laid down as his first proposition (1) that a Government could be paternal and yet be free. In this he directly controverted the position taken by his leader, the Finance Minister, in his Budget speech last year, and vindicated one of the cardinal planks in the platform of the Opposition. His next proposition (2) was, that no nation had attained to greatness in manufactures or commerce without having imposed exactions and restrictions. This was a plain statement of an historical fact, upon which the Opposition lay great stress, and its truthfulness was clearly demonstrated by the hon. gentleman in his speech on the subject. The next proposition (3) was, that protection was especially necessary in a new country—and ours is a new country—to enable it to compete with countries where manufactures are established. The hon. member recognized in his speech the fact that the cheap money, the acquired skill, and the prestige of older manufacturing countries would take the lead in the race, and, as admitted by John Stuart Mill and other Free Traders, the country that had the lead, all things being equal, would keep it; he held that this advantage an old manufacturing country had, must be counteracted by restrictions in order to enable the new country to get a start in these industries. The next proposition of the hon. gentleman (4) was that judicious protection benefitted the nation at large, and especially the farming interest; that it created for the farmer a *home market*, and that the purchasing power of labour was increased. The Opposition believed equally with the hon. gentleman that protection did benefit the agricultural interest, and they believed also that the purchasing power of the farmer's labour would be vastly enhanced by the creation and proximity of home markets, as was clearly stated by that hon. gentleman. Again, he laid down the proposition, (5) that the experience of the United States, under a protective policy, was a clear and marked illustration of the benefits of protection. If this was true when the hon. gentleman so stated it, it is equally true now; and before I sit down I will adduce a few facts in corroboration. The hon. gentleman next said (6) that the tendency of protection was not to increase, but cheapen prices to the consumer. This is an incontrovertible proposition. Protection is merely a defence of the markets of a nation to the people of that nation. It simply gave a fair field to competitive skill, industry, and capital, where the highest prizes are for those who produce the best and sell the cheapest products. The hon. member for North Norfolk cited the iron and cotton manufactures of the

United States protection is an amendment. that protect States as w which come and concisely is predicated method of effective perle able delivery nothing to se to it hereafter supposed to propositions day light.

The cou ordinary stay in this House. One of the first been favored stood very high sitions might member for N particularly a word Reform happily now a was important a new depart upon their be one very dear of Gamaliel, a motto which h which Reform My hon. frie think that pe in him to lay the House he Hamilton, and repeated, "Fre notes, proclaim but his caution members for Ha as modified, w free trade part his hon. friend trade nag shou