

expected to reap. For the nine months ending the 31st of March, we imported altogether \$11,074,465 worth of the products of the farm—that is, of grain and flour—and we exported during the same period \$20,857,017 worth, or very nearly \$10,000,000 more than we imported. Now, Sir, what was this used for? We imported it as a matter of trade, and that trade gives employment to our vessels and steamships. We have five distinct lines of steamships, sailing from the port of Montreal to the European ports, while the United States, with forty-eight millions of people, are able to maintain only one line—consisting of but four steamships. (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.)

A VOICE—Would a duty stop that trade?

Hon. Mr. MAACKENZIE.—I hear a gentleman enquire if a duty would stop that trade. Undoubtedly it would. The placing of a duty on grain and flour is much like a man who has made a road to facilitate travel between the place where he lives and the town where he does his marketing, and then for fear he should get there too easily, after the road is graded and levelled, he goes to work and cuts three or four ditches across it. (Hear, hear.) These people are afraid that our capitalists who establish the steamship lines which take the products of the Western States through Canada to the ocean should be able to take these products as well as our own too easily; and they would have us to place Custom House officers at Windsor and Sarnia, and on the Welland Canal and at the outlets to the ocean, who should say to these shippers "You should not use our avenues of trade unless you also use our Custom-houses, and give bonds to us that the vessels will be returned." They would have us place obstacles in the way of a trade that employs thousands of our sailors and artisans every year. No greater act of madness could be perpetrated at a time when we are expending \$30,000,000 in perfecting and making complete our system of canal navigation, than to go to work and erect a huge fence along our boundary line and thus prevent these foreigners from giving us their trade. The Americans ruined their foreign trade by adopting the protective system and we are invited to follow their example! (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.)

"Canada for the Canadians."

If they mean by a protective system that we are to restrict our trade, that we are to live by ourselves without commercial intercourse with the outer world, then, Sir, I can understand what these gentlemen mean when they speak of "Canada for the Canadians." They might as well say that that well known gentleman Robinson Crusoe kept the island of Juan Fernandez for himself. (Loud laughter and cheers.) In fact, Sir, the very idea of protection is embodied in Robinson Crusoe building his own house, and with a knife made out of bone whittling a weed out of which he made cloth, and with needles of bone stitching it into articles of clothing. That was protection to home industries with a vengeance; and most undoubtedly Robinson Crusoe was the leader of the Protectionist party of the Island of Juan Fernandez at that time. (Loud laughter and cheers.) Let any one of our protectionist friends of this day and generation, who are so fond of impossible theories, go and live on an island, as Mr. Crusoe did, and thus practice what they so ardently preach. (Renewed laughter and cheers.) I not only believe in having Canada for the Canadians, but the United States, South America, the West Indies, and our share of the Euro-