

prosperous. In 1867 he appealed as an Independent candidate to his constituents, who had always returned him to the New Brunswick Parliament, from 1852, without any interruption, and he was returned by a majority of more than nineteen hundred. Though his antecedents were Liberal, as were those of the hon. the Minister of Finance, who had always been a Liberal, and they had voted side by side for years, he (Sir A. J. Smith) had come to Ottawa as an Independent member of the House. He supported the Government when they were right, and opposed them when they were wrong. As every hon. gentleman knew, he had always exercised his own judgment in regard to matters submitted for the consideration of this House. When he had first come here, he had no political affinities with either party; in fact, he knew hardly any of the then public men of Canada, except by reputation. Confederation, the only question, perhaps, upon which he held opinions adverse to those of the majority of the House, had been disposed of, and accepted by both sides, and, therefore, he was entirely independent of any party. Whenever he had any doubt, he always gave the Government the benefit of the doubt, because he did not desire a change of Government at all. Then, having occupied that position for five years in this House, he returned to his constituents in 1872, and what did he say to them? He told them that he again offered himself, that he was pledged to neither one side or the other; that, during the five years he had been in Ottawa, he had been prepared to give the Government credit for everything they did; that he had found the then Government willing to do justice to his Province, and that he had supported them when they were right, and opposed them when they were wrong. He had gone further, and told them that the interests of the Lower Provinces were as safe in the hands of the Government as they would be in the hands of the Opposition. He declared himself entirely independent of both sides on that occasion, and was again elected by acclamation. He felt it necessary to make this explanation, because he did not know that he would ever have another occasion of explaining the matter, and because

there seemed to be some misapprehension with regard to the attitude which he held towards the Government of the day in 1872. The hon. the Minister of Finance knew that from 1867 to 1872, and from 1872 until the time the Government fell, he (Sir A. J. Smith) had never asked for office, and that he had declined the four propositions which were made to him. Having made this explanation, which he thought was necessary, in order to inform the House and the country the true position he occupied in reference to these matters, he thought it was necessary, in dealing with the question now before the House, to find out, if they could, when it was that this Protective policy had its origin in this country and was born. By reference to the utterances of hon. members on the Government side of the House in 1873 and 1874, he found that there was no indication at all that this was the policy of the men who were in power in 1873, and afterwards in Opposition. It was said that the Protection of 1871 was in the sense of a National Policy; but that Protection lived but a few months and then died. He would see what were the reasons given by the First Minister, and he would then call attention to the reasons given by the Finance Minister, and see how far they agreed upon this question, what was called the National Policy of 1871. They arrived at the same conclusion, but their premises were entirely different. Here was what the Minister of Finance said:

"It is true, that, in the National Policy introduced in 1871, a tax was placed on flour and coal. But you must consider the circumstances under which the tax was imposed. We were going into the Treaty of Washington, intending to make an effort to secure reciprocity, so that we would have free market for our lumber, fish, cattle and agricultural products. We could not ask for all these advantages without offering something in return. We must have something to offer for a renewal of the treaty, as we had made few changes in our tariff since it was abrogated, and the United States continued to enjoy all the privileges they possessed under it. We felt we must have something to offer as the price of its renewal, and the duties were imposed accordingly. It is supposed that these bore unequally on the Maritime Provinces, the fact being that the Maritime Provinces paid on flour, grain, coal and coke, but 5 per cent. more than Ontario and Quebec, in proportion