

depression had been going on for not less than eighteen months; and if the hon. gentleman referred to the evidence of Mr. Hay, of Toronto, who was mentioned by the right hon. member for Kingston on the previous evening, he would there find this distinctly set forth by him as well as by other witnesses. Two years passed by, and there was another opportunity for gentlemen opposite to vindicate their allegiance to the great cause of Protection, or the National Policy. In 1875 they were dumb with regard to that question. There was not, from the hon. member for Cumberland or the right hon. member for Kingston, so far as he could find, a single speech or suggestion, or a single motion, at least, to show that they desired for a moment to advance the cause of Protection. There was then just the same reason for Protection with regard to our agricultural and our mining industries; and with regard to our manufactures; there was just the same reason for inaugurating a retaliatory policy against the United States, and the necessity for building up our national industries, which existed a year afterwards. The hon. gentleman, following the lead of his hon. friend the member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving), first tabled a resolution in favour of Protection in 1876. When the Committee was appointed in that year to consider the state of commercial depression, presided over by his hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, there was considerable discussion, and so far as the right hon. member for Kingston spoke at all it was in opposition to the proposal to appoint that Committee. He endeavoured rather to discourage that appointment, and he said not a word showing that he considered the enquiry was necessary, that any benefit would result from it, or that a new policy might be founded upon it. The hon. and learned member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving), he believed it was, who moved the first resolution in this House which was of a Protectionist character, and they would remember the treatment that motion received at the hands of the right hon. member for Kingston. There was no language that he dared employ which

he did not employ, in order to cast disrepute on the mover of that resolution. But, because he chose to vote against that resolution, he had to formulate a resolution of his own, and this was the first resolution he presented to this House in favour of the National Policy he had now indicated, or rather of that Protection which he had promised to the electors of Hamilton no less than four years before. However necessary it was in the interests of the country in 1872, not one word was said by him of an authoritative and official character; not one word that would absolutely pledge him or his party to any action, until four years had elapsed, when he was forced to do something in order that it might not be said he had voted against a Protectionist resolution—or in order to justify himself for having voted against a Protectionist resolution introduced by an hon. member whom, in 1872, he maligned on the hustings, and warned the people not to send him, a Protectionist, to that House to support a Free-trade Government. The motion of the right hon. gentleman was as follows:—

“That this House regrets that His Excellency has not been advised to submit to Parliament a measure for the readjustment of the tariff, which would not only aid in alleviating the stagnation of business deplored in the gracious Speech from the Throne, but would also afford encouragement and protection to the struggling manufactures and industries, as well as to the agricultural products of the country.”

Of course, when the hon. gentleman had launched himself upon this career he was not exactly the man to turn back; he had got upon a sliding plane and rapidly began to assume the character of a Protectionist. But he was not very successful within that House in his Protectionist policy. During the last Session there were three motions submitted to the House upon the subject. That of the hon. the member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) was defeated by a majority of only 31, the motion of the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) by 39, and then one by the great leader of the Conservative party himself, which went to the wall with a majority of 49. So unsatisfactory was his policy, so uncertain, so indefinite was his resolu-

MR. DYMOND.