

answer he addressed to the president of that committee, on the 24th of March, 1876 :

"I have only received to-day a series of printed questions from your commission, in whose work I take a very deep interest, and I hasten to send you my answers. I am afraid they will be found somewhat lengthy, but I must say that I feel a certain amount of satisfaction in being able to formulate my views on this subject, whatever may be the worth of such views. In fact, it is a kind of protest against charges brought against me during this Session, in the House of Commons and in the public press—that I have abandoned the principal article of the programme of our national party. What we claim above all is a national trade policy. My friends have been charged with having abandoned it, and as leader of the national party, my name has been mixed up with those reproaches; but I have not abandoned that policy."

Now, in answer to the following question which was put to him by the committee :

"Is it in the interest of Canada to continue to admit American products free from duty, while the products exported on the other side of the frontier are liable to a high duty?"

He said :

"No; it is against the interests of Canada. I humbly believe that only raw material used for manufactures should be admitted free from duty.

"It is not by lowering the price of everything that we will ever attain national wealth. The dearer we pay the better it is for us, provided our means of paying are at par with the increase of prices. Ask the laborer which he prefers—flour at \$4.50 per barrel and no work, or flour at \$6 and plenty of work. Agriculture and manufacturing may together insure great results; but let these two industries isolate their interests, and their divided forces will be far from accomplishing as much."

It may be said that the hon. Mr. Joly is no longer the leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec. I know that; in fact, he has had the same fate in the Provincial House which was met by another leader of the Liberal party in this House. Perhaps the mode of procedure was less violent but that was all the difference. It is traditional in that party to behead the chiefs when they do not lead to victory. If I am told that Mr. Joly is no longer the leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, one thing will be admitted, and it is that the hon. member for East Quebec—who, I regret to say, is not in his seat—is at the present moment the leader in the Dominion Parliament of the Liberal party of the Province of Quebec. Well, that hon. member, and not very long ago at that, held the same opinions, the same sentiments, on protection. In 1871, when he held a seat in the Quebec House, he said :

"Quite a number of years ago the great patriot we have just lost, the Hon. L. J. Papineau, seeking a remedy to the evils from which we were suffering, summarised his policy on the subject by this simple precept; 'We must buy nothing from the metropolis.' I am of opinion that that policy is to-day forcing itself upon us with as much weight as it did even at the time when it was formulated. It is a duty for us, and especially for us Canadians of French origin, to create national industry."

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, our hon. friends will say: Why, this was a long time ago—it is many years since our leader expounded on the question of protection, those ideas which are those professed to-day by the Conservative party. I will quote, Mr. Speaker, utterances which are a little more fresh. They were uttered as far back as the 22nd of March, 1877. Mr. Laurier was not then, it is true, as strong a protectionist as he had been in 1871; but he was still fairly so, as may be judged by the following short extract from one of his speeches:—

"I am of opinion, however, that certain industries cannot be established without the aid of the Legislature; and I say it openly, in the presence of my political friends."

As will be seen, these words from Mr. Laurier have been uttered not many years ago, and they prove one thing: It is, that our friends opposite have completely given up the economical ideas which they formerly held. They have sacrificed everything to the domination of their allies, the Grits. At this same meeting of 1872 another leader of the Liberal party, who is not sitting in this House, it is true, but who has a seat in the highest House in the country, the hon. Mr. Pelletier, said:

Mr. Tassé.

"The manufactures in the different branches of industry which we might develop with such beneficial results, do not receive the necessary protection. You will probably tell me that, nevertheless, a strong impulse was given towards progress; that the spirit of enterprise seems to spring up. Yes, gentlemen, hunger and misery have often led to superhuman efforts. The terrible commercial crisis which prevails to-day, while alarming those who were most confident in a brighter future, induces them to make supreme efforts in order to avoid complete ruin. It is true that generous efforts have been made for some time back; a few enterprising capitalists are trying, it is true, to establish manufactures, but have they been able to inspire confidence in their success? Have they been able to do away with this great objection of the tariff, which makes it impossible to export our produce? What guarantee have they when they risk their capital in manufactures which are constantly exposed to a change in the tariff, which might paralyse everything? There is alongside of us a population of forty millions, with whom we are unable to trade. Our country offers immense advantages, and in spite of that it is still the most backward country in America, owing to the want of encouragement to manufactures."

If I wanted to make a review of most of the prominent members of the Opposition, I might do, what has already been done besides, I might show that these gentlemen have all, one after another, been in favor of a protective tariff. I heard the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) telling us a while ago that the Government had done nothing to encourage sugar industries in this country. That gentleman has forgotten the very important fact that under the Mackenzie Administration the sugar refineries closed their doors, which they have re-opened since the establishment of the protective tariff. He has forgotten that, in 1876, his colleague, the hon. Mr. Jones, who was then sitting on this side of the House, on the Ministerial benches—but that did not last very long, I am not sorry to say—was clamoring in vain for protection on sugar. I shall quote his own words, pronounced in this House on the 3rd of April, 1876 :

"He might be laboring under a misapprehension, but he understood the hon. member for South Waterloo, on a former occasion, when he introduced his motion relating to the West India trade, to allude to the sugar refining interests as likely to be greatly benefited thereby. If the hon. member was in earnest in his proposition to subsidise a line of steamers then, he could not understand his position now. The hon. gentleman had said that but 300 persons were interested in the sugar trade, but if the number of vessels engaged in this large commerce with the West Indies and the men indirectly connected with the business were taken into account, we would find that number swell into thousands. He thanked the hon. Postmaster General, for the stand he had taken on this question. If the refinery in Montreal could have worked under the present system no application would have been made, but it had been sufficiently demonstrated that it was impossible to keep open refineries in the face of the bounty allowed by the United States. It was no use tinkering with the tariff, but the Government should be prepared to deal with the American system, which was annihilating our trade. When \$2.50 duty per 100 pounds was paid, and a drawback of \$3.00 was allowed, which was equal to ½ a cent per pound, it was plain to be seen that no tariff would enable a refinery to exist in Canada. Unless a duty was imposed equal to the bounty, it would be no use trying to do anything."

In 1877, the hon. Mr. Jones returned to the charge and again reproved the Government. Here is what he said on the 9th of March :

"The sugar interest demanded some consideration, because, if some legislation did not speedily take place, he was afraid we were going to lose a large trade with the West Indies. That trade, in the Maritime Provinces, at the present moment, involved from three to four million dollars a year, but the inevitable result of the present policy would be to drive the whole trade to the United States. We sent our vessels with outward cargoes, which were sold in the West Indies, and they were obliged to take the sugar to the United States to have it refined. Cargoes of sugar passed through the Boston refineries, and in 24 or 36 hours were exported into Canada again under a bounty of 50 per cent. Such a system could not continue very long. In a short time, when the Americans found out that they had destroyed our trade, they would dictate their own terms, and then it would be seen how disastrous the present policy was."

We did precisely what was asked by the hon. Mr. Jones, when he had his seat among the Ministerial benches. He wanted to protect that industry, and since that time we have seen not only the great Redpath refinery opening its doors at Montreal, but we have seen others cropping up or taking large proportions. I was speaking a while ago of the Liberal leaders in this House and at Quebec. In 1881—it is not a very long time since—the hon. leader of the Opposition was visiting Montreal. We were on the eve of general elections. The hon. gentleman was visiting