

gentleman who was also a colleague of the late Prime Minister, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), was returned in 1871, by the united counties of Drummond and Arthabaska, for the Local Legislature. At the meeting of that Legislature, he rose, and, during the debate on the Address, he complained of the depression which he pretended to prevail throughout the country, laying it at the door of the Conservative party then in power in Quebec and in Ottawa. The course of that depression he described in this way :—

"The principal cause of the evil from which we are suffering is that, until now, the production of the country has not equalled the consumption."

He (Mr. Houde) would ask his hon. friend what better means could be devised to increase the production of the country than by protecting its industries, and thereby increasing its power of production? And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) went on to remark, in the same speech, that Canada was like a man on a bag of gold without being able to use it; or again, as Tantalus, who had a tree laden with ripe fruits, over his head, and water up to his chin, but could not reach either, in order to allay his hunger and thirst. This was how the hon. member for Quebec East depicted Canada in 1871. Yet they all knew that the country was far less suffering then than to-day; that circumstances had altered to an extent which required much more stringently the adoption of the National Policy that the hon. gentleman and his allies had already advocated eloquently. If the House had not fully realised the former views of the National Party, of which he (Mr. Houde) saw here several distinguished members in front of him, he would take the liberty to quote the words of the leader of that party, the Hon. Mr. Joly, who was at present Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec. On the 24th of March, 1876, writing from Quebec to Mr. Orton, chairman of the Committee of the House of Commons on Agriculture, he said :

"MY DEAR DOCTOR,—I received, only to-day, a series of printed enquiries, coming from your Committee, in the labours of which I take a deep interest, and I hasten to send you my answers. I fear lest they be a little long; but I must say that I experience a certain

satisfaction to be able to give my views on the subject, of whatever little value they may be.

"It is a kind of protest against the accusation of inconsistency which has been brought against me during that Session, in the House of Commons, and in the Press, to have abandoned the principal plank of the platform of our National party. We claimed, above all, a National Commercial Policy. My friends have been reproached with having abandoned it, and, as the leader of the National party, my name has been coupled with those reproaches; but I have not abandoned that policy."

The House remembered, doubtless, on what memorable occasion that National Policy had been abandoned by the Liberal party. It was when the Hon. Alfred Jones, afterwards Minister of Militia, went to the Ministers of the late Administration, and threatened them with the withdrawal of his support and the support of all the Liberal members from Nova Scotia, if the protecting tariff, which was already framed and ready to be submitted to the Parliament, was proposed by the Government of the day. The National Policy was then dropped, and, with it, down went the Liberal party. The Hon. Mr. Joly was still more explicit in answering the following enquiry :—

"Is it in the interest of Canada that we should continue to admit American products free, while Canadian products exported to the other side of the frontier are submitted to heavy duties?"

"Answer.—No; it is against the interest of Canada. I humbly believe that we should admit free only the raw materials used by our manufactures."

And, again :

"It is not by causing the price of everything to go down that we shall reach national wealth. The dearer we pay, the better for us, providing that our means of paying be at par with the increase of prices. Ask the working-man what he prefers—flour at \$4.50 a barrel and no work, or flour at \$6 and plenty of work? Agriculture and manufacture can, together, arrive at great results; but let those two industries separate their interests, and their divided strengths will be far from being able to accomplish as much."

There was the best answer that could be made to the so-called friends of the poor, who cried for the policy of cheap bread with no work, and it came from one of their own party. That was how the leader of the National party expressed himself on Protection three years ago. The country had been told by prominent Liberals, even in this House, how high-