

ing a seat in this House ; a gentleman whose great abilities were acknowledged by every one, and whose opinions had generally great weight with his friends. Let him read a few lines from the proceedings of the Dominion Board of Trade at their Session in 1872—precisely the same year in which some gentlemen in the Liberal ranks were said to have advocated Protectionist principles. He read from these proceedings the following resolution, moved by Mr. T. White, of Montreal :

“That without offering any opinion upon some of the details of the present Customs tariff, or upon the anomalies which are inevitable in all tariffs, this Board is of opinion that no change 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.

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

This resolution, he thought, showed, conclusively, that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) in 1872 upheld the principles of a revenue tariff. It was true that the able speech delivered yesterday by the hon. gentleman indicated that his opinions were completely modified, but was he to be blamed for this ? He (Mr. Béchard) thought not ; and this example only showed that even distinguished men would occasionally change their minds like ordinary mortals. But, if this spectacle could be seen on both sides of this House, he thought that hon. gentlemen opposite ought to refrain from throwing stones, seeing that they were living in glass houses. During the course of this debate, their attention had often been called to the United States ; and they had been invited by several hon. members, amongst whom he particularly noticed his hon. friend the member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) to behold the great prosperity prevailing in that country under the rule of Protection. His hon. friend was by no means an Annexationist, and, if anyone ever doubted his loyalty, that doubt might have been removed when he delivered

his able speech. The hon. member seemed inclined to denounce not only annexation, but even those who, in years gone by, might have entertained annexation proclivities. He devoted a considerable part of his speech to the late L. A. Papineau, particularly deprecating the admiration of that celebrated tribune of the people for American institutions. However, as the delivery of the speech proceeded, he (Mr. Béchard) could soon infer that, after all, his hon. friend thought there was something pretty good in the United States. He spoke in glowing terms of the wonderful prosperity of that country, and, doubtless following the example of his hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault), he was pleased to quote largely from Henry Clay, one of the United States' most gifted sons. It seemed, indeed, as if his hon. friend thought Henry Clay the only authority worth being quoted, and, as if he had entirely forgotten great British authorities, such as Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden, John Bright and other distinguished British statesmen, whose opinions, on economic matters, had, of late, thrown so much light upon the commercial world. But that pretended prosperity of the United States had not been demonstrated by hon. gentlemen opposite to be a reality, whilst his hon. friends from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had clearly shown, by referring to incontrovertible facts, that that prosperity, so much boasted of, was nothing but a sham, as compared with the prosperity of that country in former years. Who did not remember that, for years, four millions of individuals called tramps totally ceased to be producers, whilst remaining consumers, under the so-called benevolent rule of Protection ? Such a state of things was unknown to the United States before. Who did not remember that, during the summer of 1877, an immense row, extending from East to West, and provoked by a reduction of wages, took place in that country, and that, after having almost assumed the proportions of a rebellion, it could only be put down by the concentration of troops, after the destruction of eight or ten million dollars' worth of property ? Surely such facts as those were not indications of a very high state of prosperity.