

able them to secure feed for their lines of products at a low figure. The natural enemy of the agriculturists in one sense is the miller, for the miller who requires the products of the soil to a large extent would like to obtain those products as cheaply as possible. Therefore, the removal of the duty from wheat would be to the advantage of the miller; but I feel assured that the farmers of Ontario would be very sorry indeed to see the duty taken off wheat, while a duty of 75 cents a barrel was maintained on flour. For a similar reason it would be equally unjust for the agriculturists of the Dominion to have the duty taken off coarse grains with a view to enabling the feeders of stock to secure feed for their cattle at a lower figure. The object of the National Policy is to so adjust the advantages to the different industries as not only to make it beneficial to all concerned, but also to enable the Government to raise a sufficient revenue to maintain the public services of the country. My hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) referred to the protection of coal. Surely, there is no one from the province of Nova Scotia, particularly, who would ever advocate the abolition of the duty on coal. During the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite there was no duty on coal, and, unfortunately for that industry, it was so depressed that the coal miners were begging for aid throughout the districts in which the mines were situated. The output of coal in 1878 did not amount to more than half a million tons in the whole province of Nova Scotia, whereas in 1895 it amounted in round numbers, to 2,000,000 tons. This was unquestionably owing to the beneficial effects of the National Policy; and that industry, besides giving employment to the coal miners, also gave employment to ships, gave markets for the farmers in the neighbourhood of the mines, and increased the revenue of the province, in fifteen years, to the amount of \$150,000 a year. Would it not, therefore, be most disastrous to the industry to have the duty on coal abolished? And if the duty on coal, or the duty on any other important line of products of this Dominion be abolished, then, as I predicted in this House on a former occasion, the National Policy would fall to pieces. It is essential, in the interests of the National Policy, that all lines be equitably protected; therefore, the abolition of the duty on any great line of products of the Dominion would be disastrous to the whole policy. It has also been said that the National Policy has not been of any advantage to the fishermen. Surely no one from the maritime provinces would make a statement of that kind, expecting it to be believed, at least in the maritime provinces. The fisheries are well protected under the National Policy. A bounty has been given to the fishermen, lines of goods which are used by the hardy fishermen of the maritime

provinces have been admitted free of duty, and the fish itself is protected. So that it is idle for any person to say that the fisheries of this Dominion are not well protected by the National Policy, and that the fishermen are not contented with that policy. The mechanics and labourers are also protected, as well as the manufacturers. Without the market afforded by the manufacturers, the labourers, the mechanics, the miners, and the fishermen, and, unless these industries are prosperous, the farmers will have but poor markets for their products. It is necessary, in order to maintain the equilibrium between the various industries, to have the compromise, as it is, and as it was, and as it should be, between the various industries well maintained, and to have withal a sufficient revenue to enable the Government to maintain the public service of the country. In 1878 the policy adopted by the Liberal-Conservative party was this:

That this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving, as it ought to do, in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade.

In all the discussions that have taken place in this House up to the present time, I find that the impression is general that the object of the National Policy was reciprocal free trade. But the resolution speaks for itself. Its object was to move in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs, and its aim was to retain those people at home who were obliged to expatriate themselves in search of employment abroad. Therefore, it was not, in my opinion, the intention of the National Policy to have reciprocal free trade between Canada and the United States. It has been changed at various times as much as practicable in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs. At present, it is true, the revenue tariff of the United States is about 10 per cent higher than that of Canada. In my opinion, the present Government should go further in the line of a reciprocity of tariffs, as indicated in the resolution introduced by Sir John Macdonald as early as 1877 and 1878. Let us examine how far even that extent of reciprocity of tariffs has affected the trade between Canada and the United States. Referring to the imports and exports, I find that the imports for home consumption from the United States in 1878 amounted, in all, to \$48,631,739.