

That was after the change of Government; he presumed after the six months within which the hon. gentleman had predicted that the Government would be overthrown. The late Government challenged full enquiry, to see if they had not conducted public affairs to the entire satisfaction of the people. He repeated that, in the Session of 1874, the hon. gentlemen now in power never contemplated a policy of Protection. They declared the country to be in a most prosperous condition; that the country, notwithstanding the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty, was becoming rich; that they could find markets for their agricultural produce in every part of the world, and that they were not dependent upon the United States. He had now occasion to refer to the position taken by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). He was a gentleman who represented very advanced thoughts and ideas; he had studied the public affairs of this country, if not in this House, outside of it, and if he was not here long ago it was not his fault, because he tried often enough, and his utterances were entitled to considerable consideration. While that gentleman said now that he was a Protectionist, in 1873 he was entirely opposed to Protection, as shown by the resolution which he moved in the Dominion Board of Trade, at the annual meeting:

"That, without forming any opinion upon some of the details of the present Customs tariff, and the anomalies, which are inevitable in all tariffs, this Board is of opinion that no changes should be made in it, unless the exigencies of the public service demand larger revenues; and that in such case any increase to be made should be in accordance with the principle of the present Customs tariff, which, while not interfering with the commerce of the Dominion, affords incidental Protection to its manufactures."

He did not say that Free-trade was practicable in this country. He said they must have incidental Protection, must have a revenue tariff, having a proper regard for the industries of the country. The resolution concluded as follows:—

"That this Board is further of opinion that permanence in the fiscal policy of the country is most important alike to its commerce and its manufactures, and that no changes should be made in the tariff not demanded by the absolute necessities of the revenue."

How was it that the hon. gentleman changed his mind since then? He (Sir Albert J. Smith) did not believe that he had changed his honest conviction, but that he was really of the same opinion still, because it was based upon sound reason—that they could not stimulate, encourage and foster industries that required artificial means to sustain them. He (Sir A. J. Smith) thought he had shown that the National Policy was the outcome of political necessities of the gentlemen on the other side, and that it was not the result of conviction, because he found that, up to 1874, they never uttered a word in favour of the National Policy. It was said that Protection had accomplished wonders for the United States, and Mr. Wells had been quoted in connection with that assertion. He would quote from a lecture that was delivered, in 1878, before a Science Congress in Cincinnati, to show the effect of Protection on the industries of that country as compared with effect of Free-trade as it existed in England. It was as follows:—

"The great commerce of England has been built upon invention, and by a policy of ocean postal service, which enables her to reach every seaport by steam on the face of the earth. Her merchants are in every land; her marine on every sea. How our foreign commerce fails before that of England—less than one-third—yet you may put the United Kingdom into Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, and have 15,000,000 acres to spare. Last year we mined 42,000,000 tons of coal; England, 133,000,000. She built 687 sailing vessels, and 300 steamers, last year; we, six steamers, seven ships, four brigs! Last year she produced \$124,000,000 of wool, clothed her people, and exported \$115,000,000; we purchased \$7,000,000, and exported \$317,000 worth. England paid us \$191,000,000 for our cotton, and exported \$358,000,000 of cotton goods, while we, raising the cotton, exported \$13,000,000 worth. England manufactured 6,000,000,000 yards of cotton goods, sending 1,155,000,000 to India; 279,000,000 to Turkey; 100,000,000 to Egypt; 54,000,000 to the United States—more to this country than we to all the world—178,000,000 to Brazil; we, 5,000,000 yards. She sent to all South Africa, 354,000,000; we, 53,000,000. China, in 1860, took from us 5,300,000 yards; from England, 150,000 yards. Last year we sent 11,000,000 yards to that land; England, 408,000,000. Such has been the development of trade with that country."

Now, that was a country where cotton was produced, and its manufacture was