

could manufacture at home. Our lumber trade was paralyzed. The supply had been altogether too great for the demand, and prices had so decreased in consequence that there was nothing to be made in the business. In reference to our farming interests, he would remind honorable gentlemen that some years when the crops are light, we are obliged to import wheat—at least, it was so in the part of Ontario from which he came. Therefore, it would not do to depend exclusively upon agriculture. The farmer cannot give steady employment to labor except during four or five months of the year. Would it be wise, therefore, to have our country dependent solely upon agriculture? The establishment of manufactures would benefit the farmer as well as every one else. For instance, in Ottawa and Hull there is a population of 40,000, of which one-fourth is dependent entirely upon the lumber trade of this place and its various manufactures. Close those establishments and 10,000 people—one fourth of the population which consumes the products raised in the surrounding country—would be obliged to find employment elsewhere. In such a case, is not the farmer injured by the loss of so much of his market? It was evident, therefore, that in a country like ours, it was important to build up manufacturing industries to give employment to the people at all times and under any circumstances. We spend thousands of dollars annually to encourage people to come to Canada, but when they arrive, finding no employment, they go to the neighboring country to swell its population and increase its industries. Diversified employment was necessary to develop our resources and bring wealth and population to the country. The farmer might have to pay a little more, but it would be repaid to him by the advantages a larger home market would afford, and the country would enjoy a large measure of prosperity.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he was surprised to hear this policy which was advocated by honorable gentlemen opposite spoken of as a "national policy." It seemed to him that there were several ingredients of a national policy in which it was lacking. Canada was part of a great empire and a national policy should be in conformity with the policy of the empire, while this was in direct contradiction of the policy of Great Britain. A national policy should also be a permanent policy, but instead of that this was proposed merely as a temporary expedient arising out of the new relation or parties. It was a policy that might have been proposed a great many times during the administration of honorable gentlemen opposite, but the

country heard very little of it then, and though one or two faint efforts at something like it might be shown, there was nothing like this great broad policy now proposed. This policy then was neither imperial nor permanent. The first attempt to introduce any part of this national policy, now so-called, was before Confederation by the imposition of a duty upon grain and breadstuffs. Coal was at that time a matter of no very great interest to the Province of United Canada, and nobody therefore proposed to put a duty on it. He could recollect very well the result of that attempt at a policy; he could recollect the Mayor of Montreal at the head of a large body of citizens meeting Sir George Cartier at the railway depot on his return from England and begging him for God's sake not to continue to impose a duty on breadstuffs, and thus starve the poor. Respecting that time Mr. W. W. Oglevie, of Montreal, had made some remarks which he would presently quote. The same gentleman had, within a few months, declared himself a protectionist "up to the hilt;" but he had added "You must not put a duty on grain for that is my raw material." That was Mr. Oglevie's idea of protection. It was all very well to bite the other man's dog, but his dog must be protected from anything of that sort. The same gentleman, at the meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade in 1874, said, as to the incident already mentioned:—

"I wish to say a word or two with reference to the grain and flour trade. We had a duty upon these articles for two seasons, and gave it a fair trial. I recollect at that time we shipped Canadian wheat to Liverpool, and also American wheat, on which there was a duty of four cents per bushel, and at Liverpool the question was never asked which was American and which was Canadian wheat. They were both sold on their merits. Was that any protection to the farmer? We were then told that was a year of surplus, but wait until we should have a year of scarcity. The next year was a year of scarcity, and we had to import into Canada two million bushels of wheat, and pay four cents a bushel on it. That is to say, the staff of life was taxed to that extent. It was said a duty of twenty-five cents a barrel on flour would enable us to supply the Maritime Provinces; but if a merchant in the Maritime Provinces has to sell a cargo of fish in New York, he should not be compelled to pay twenty-five cents a barrel duty on a return cargo of flour. I can make a barrel of flour as cheap as any man in the Dominion or the United