

axe in hand, and converted a wilderness into a thriving colony. Were they now to be taken by the throat and told that they must, whether they liked it or not, support by taxes those who knew none of these hardships?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Can a country be built up and maintained by a farming population alone?

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he thought Canada had been built up by the farmers and lumbermen, and those who had carried their goods to market, not by a class of late existence.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS—Have not the manufacturers kept pace with the progress of the country?

Hon. Mr. PENNY—The manufacturers did not come here until the farmers had prepared the country for them.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—Where do you leave the lumbering and mining?

Hon. Mr. PENNY said that, of course, he included them with the farmers, fishermen, shipowners, forwarders and other great interests that made this country first, and would maintain it still, whether there were manufacturers here or not. Those interests were self-supporting interests, the lumbering, farming, stock raising, shipping and forwarding, &c., who could not be benefited; but must be injured by protection on manufactures.

Hon. Mr. READ—Is the lumber to last for all time to come?

Hon. Mr. PENNY—When it is done the lumbermen will have to do something else or starve.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD—We will not starve. When the timber is cleared off we have good soil, and when the lumber is gone we have the soil and the minerals to fall back upon.

Hon. Mr. FLINT—Where are our lumbermen to find a market?

Hon. Mr. PENNY—And if they have not a market, will it give them one to charge them more for pork and clothing? He continued to remark that the classes he had mentioned, the lumbermen and those who made their living out of the soil, after they had raised their products had to go abroad for their markets, and they had to take their chances with the rest of the world for their prices. If there was an exceedingly good crop in Russia or other parts of Europe, our people would have to compete with the low prices of these grains, and if they had thus to meet a slaughter market with their produce abroad, why should they not be allowed to take advantage of a slaughter market at home, and expend their money where they could buy cheapest, in-

stead of being met with high protective duties, which would be levied to support people who pretended they could not live except in glass cases. It could not be pretended for a moment that Canada, even with all the manufacturing population which the most enthusiastic could imagine, could consume all her own natural productions, so that it was impossible to save the producers of these things from the necessity of going abroad to sell. Now who was hurt by the American duties? Surely, if Canadian manufacturers could not compete with foreign manufacturers at home, they could not do it abroad; if they could not compete with American manufacturers in Canada, they could not compete with them in the United States. As, then, they did not go into the American markets, and by the hypothesis submitted to the House could not do so, the American duty did not hurt them. The man who suffered from it was the Canadian producer who went to the United States with his grain, his lumber, his cheese, his animals, or the other things we exported thither on which this duty was levied. Take a farmer from the Eastern Townships, for instance, who drove his waggon load of butter or cheese across the line, and willingly paid thirty per cent. duty, because, after allowing for that, he found sometimes a higher market on the other side than on his own. When he got there and sold his load, he would perhaps see certain goods that suited his fancy. If he bought them to bring back with him, would it be to his advantage to have to pay thirty per cent. instead of seventeen and a half per cent. (on them before he could get them across the Canadian line? Yet that was the way they were going to redress the injury which the American tariff did to our exporters by this so-called national policy.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—What does the honorable gentleman say to the duty on paper?

Hon. Mr. PENNY thought in that respect the tariff was wrong, if the facts were as stated which he was not sure of; but that was a mere item, having nothing to do with the main question, which was one of principle, not of detail.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It is a very strong argument in favor of readjustment.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he thought all taxation was an evil—a necessary evil—but it should be restricted to its necessary basis, that was, the support of the Government, and not the support of those who wanted other people to be taxed that they might live better. And now another remark. He did not see that the manufacturers as a class were