

to refer to subjects which had been brought forward on similar motions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD thought so, if the motion to retain the Speaker in the chair was on the same subject.

Mr. SPEAKER--I have left the chair.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD was of opinion that every time Mr. Speaker was prevented from leaving the chair by a motion like the present, in intercepting the main motion, it was practically a continuation of the same subject. A similar motion was made the other day by the hon. member for Halifax, and it was but fair that on the pending resolution allusions to the previous debate should be permitted.

Mr. PALMER said he did not view the question in the same light as Mr. Speaker. This was not merely a question to leave the Chair, but the question before the House was the policy initiated or maintained by the Budget Speech. However, he bowed to the ruling, the only effect of which as regards himself would be to shorten his remarks. Mr. Palmer continued: It is a pity that those gentlemen who have asked protection from the Government have not been treated with courtesy.

As I said before the question of protection or free-trade is one as to which I have always accorded my views in favour of free trade. My hon. friend from Stanstead says it is no use talking about free-trade because we cannot get it, and because it is actually beyond the scope of legislation. Not having free-trade, it is the duty of the House to foster, by all the means in its power, the industries of this country, he cared not whether they were the manufacturing or agricultural interests. It is simply a question as to the best mode of legislating for the purpose, without doing wrong to any. I have the idea that manufactures cannot flourish nor can anything else, without the country is made cheap to live in. If there is a large expenditure the money will have to be taken from the pockets of the people. I will hold up both my hands in favour of any measure that will prevent an increase of the expenditure.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Of course the country is justified in creating a debt for the purpose of fostering industries and for building up the country. In the matter of immigration a considerable sum is spent; but it is for the purpose of developing the country, although it is no less a bounty than a sum would be to benefit manufactures. I agree with the hon. member for Stanstead that no one industry can flourish without others. The farming population would be very poor if it were not for manufactures. I was surprised to hear the Finance Minister say that protection would build up towns but would deplete the country. I always believed that if a large town is built up that a large country adjoining it must necessarily be benefited, as the farmers would have to supply the manufacturers.

Some of my hon. friends, and particularly my hon. friend from Cumberland, enumerated the doctrine that a duty should be placed on coal and flour. I must record my dissent from my hon. friend. I would like to foster them, but I don't believe this would be brought about by paying duties upon them. I don't apply these remarks to the coarse grains, but more particularly to flour and also to coal, both of which are absolutely essential to manufacturers. I must confess that my views upon this question are very nearly in accord with those of the hon. member for South Waterloo; but I want to say that the hon. gentleman in his speech, and in the statistics that he gave to the House contradicted his argument. If I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman started with the idea that protection to manufacturers meant nothing but an increase cost to the farmer. A little further on, that gentleman quoted from, I think, an American authority to prove what he wanted to prove, viz.:—That protection was destructive to workmen themselves. He showed that the cost of living under protection in the United States had increased in a greater ratio than the cost of wages, and then he showed that the cost of everything had increased five-sixths, and that farmers' produce cost double what it would have done under another system. And then he replied to the assertion that our markets were being slaughter-