

“On certain sections of the community, and so now they were repealed, as a step in the right direction.”

It was then “a step in the right direction,” at that time, to repeal these duties which “worked oppressively” with respect to large portions of the population, while the step to-day recommended was to reimpose these duties in order to weld us together in one people, that we might have no sectional differences and no sectional grievances as the offspring of class and sectional legislation. The right hon. gentleman had, in that debate, a warm supporter, a gentleman who afterwards became a member of the Government, and whom he (Mr. Dymond) then saw gazing upon him, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope). And there was also present another hon. gentleman, the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Gibbs). The hon. member for South Ontario had always been consistent, he (Mr. Dymond) believed, with regard to these questions, and he did not at all, for one moment, doubt that he (Mr. Gibbs) in voting for a National Policy, as it was called, believed that he was carrying out just the same policy that he desired to maintain in 1863, but what did his hon. friend from Compton say in reply to Mr. Gibbs, who opposed the repeal of the duty on flour? Mr. Pope said:

“The hon. gentleman, while avowing broad principles, had spoken just like a sectional representative. His (Mr. Gibbs's) view was that which suited precisely the interests of Western Canada, while the people of the Eastern Townships, which he (Mr. Pope) represented, felt that on this question their interests were the same as those of Nova Scotia. Mr. Pope continued his speech maintaining the inadvisability of attempting to subserve party interests upon Protectionist principles, which were prejudicial to the general welfare.”

Now, his hon. friend (Mr. Pope) had, the preceding evening, seconded the motion which was to permit sectional interests to subvert the general welfare. Of course, he (Mr. Pope) did not see that he was inconsistent. No doubt the hon. gentleman believed that he was all right, and he would not really attempt to bring him into line. He must leave the hon. gentleman where he was, presenting his

views in 1868 in contrast with the views which, by seconding this amendment, he presumed the hon. gentleman held in 1878.

MR. POPE: They are the same.

MR. DYMOND said then there passed two years, during which they had no national policy; but, in 1870, Sir Francis Hincks having then become Finance Minister, what was known as the National Policy was, for the first time, introduced. Sir Francis Hincks, in April, 1870, proposed to impose certain protective duties, avowedly in a protective sense, on flour of 25c. per barrel, on Indian and oatmeal 15c. per barrel, on wheat 4c. per bushel, on other grain 3c., on coal 50c. per ton, and on salt 5c. per bushel, excluding, however, British salt from duty, and ultimately the salt used in the sea and gulf fisheries. He should have occasion to point out, before he had done, how that very exclusion virtually counteracted what were supposed to be the beneficial effects of the National Policy, so far as the duty on salt was concerned. At the same time, an *ad va'orem* duty was levied of 10 per cent. on all animals. This policy was assailed throughout the country. He remembered that this was one of the first political sensations that occurred after he had the honour of becoming a Canadian citizen; and he ventured to say that there had been no act done by any Government during the last eight years of a legislative character that had excited so much animadversion as this so-called National Policy of Sir Francis Hincks. On the afternoon of the 26th day of April, 1870, Sir Francis Hincks came down to the House and announced that, so far as coal and wheat were concerned, which, after all, were the two great factors in this arrangement, he had decided to abandon the National Policy; and, on the morning of the following day, the *Leader* newspaper of Toronto, the proprietor of which was a devoted follower of the hon. gentlemen opposite, while he (Mr. Beatty) had a seat in that House, and who he (Mr. Dymond) presumed, from his years and his wisdom, might be regarded in some sense as the Nestor of his party