

of this country. It is a policy which is not suitable to this progressive age. It is a policy which properly belongs to feudal times and a past age—one which the Government, when they come to consider the effect of it, and cast aside those influences by which they surround themselves with power—when they take a patriotic view of those things, and work more for the country and less for their party, will see is not in the best interests of the Dominion. The Minister of the Interior, in reply to my hon. friend from Ottawa, spoke about that lucky star that guides this Government. He spoke of the sunshine in which they are basking. I may say to the Minister of the Interior, that I hope the time may speedily come when the sunshine will not alone fall upon this Government entrenched as they are on the treasury benches, that the dark clouds will break and the whole people of this country will get the benefit of that sunshine; when the laborers and farmers, and the lumbermen and fishermen of this country will reap the full advantages of their toil, and will not be compelled to contribute from their resources further than is necessary for the purposes of government.

HON. MR. DEVER—I am sure after the long and labored debate that has taken place on this great subject it would be the height of bad taste on my part to desire to continue it much longer. It must be a matter of pride to all to see the manner in which the debate has been conducted. It must show to the country that it was the desire of the Senate that a subject affecting the true interests of this country should be debated in the most intelligent and able manner. I feel, myself, notwithstanding the length of this debate, that after all, the jury to determine this question will be the country. Whether one party or the other may fancy they get the victory in this House matters not; it will not have the slightest influence on the people. The arguments pro and con as affecting our commercial interests and our true prosperity will be sifted thoroughly, and I think an accurate judgment will be arrived at by the people. Notwithstanding the great ability displayed on the part of some speakers who took part in this debate, I took notice of what may be

called a heresy in political economy, that has been indulged in by both sides in debating this subject. I could not help feeling somewhat surprised that statements should be made that vast quantities of money had been lost to this country by investments in manufacturing industries. It was said that the stockholders had lost their stock and that factories which had cost some \$260,000 or \$300,000 were a total loss and that business was crippled in consequence of this capital having been taken out of its legitimate course and virtually lost to the country. I take exception to this statement at once. I think I have studied some of the laws of political economy. I think I have been taught to believe that when money is taken from the banks or taken from private individuals and put into actual labor in the country, that instead of its being lost to the public it is simply displaced and put into circulation in the hands of the laboring classes. It enters the business of the shop-keepers, the tradespeople, doctors and lawyers and various citizens who dwell in our country. It is true it is taken from one and goes into the possession of another, but still not one dollar is lost to the country. A gentleman who took the opposite side of the argument seemed to think that that proposition was a fair one; he did not think it was wrong. Men go into business and lose their capital. He took it as a matter of fact that the capital was lost, and that men in the lumber trade, for instance, lost their money in the woods, and went into bankruptcy. Now the two cases, according to my view of the strict rules of political economy, are not similar. In the first place, if money be invested in getting lumber, it has to go to a foreign country; and if the expenses incurred are not met by the amount realized by the sale, then of course there is a loss to the country of the difference between the cost and the amount received from the sale; but in the other case where the work is going on in our own country and the money is paid for labor, I think it will be found on reflection that the statements of hon. gentlemen on the other side are not correct. I do not know that it is necessary for me to go much further into the question; in fact I do not know that I could, if I tried, go over the grounds that have