

his young country, and the adoption of a proper policy in its interests, he wrote from England to Humphrey Marshall in the following language, which I quote in illustration and in confirmation of the belief of the opposition in the sisterhood of the industries, and in their being mutually helpful to one another:—

"Every manufacture encouraged in our country makes part of the market for provisions within ourselves, and saves so much money for the country as must otherwise be exported to pay for the manufactures or supplies."

He was then speaking of his own country: of England, he said:—

"Here in England it is well known and understood that wherever a manufactory is established, which employs a number of hands, it raises the value of the land in the neighboring country all around it, partly by the greater demand near at hand for the produce of the land and partly from the plenty of money drawn by the manufacturers to that part of the country. *It seems, therefore, the necessity of all our farmers and owners of land to encourage our young manufactures in preference to foreign ones imported among us from distant countries.*"

Dr Franklin was a shrewd man; he was an observing man; he was in pursuit of truth; and this was the deduction which he drew from his observations in England, and which he communicated patriotically to his people for their guidance. This harmonized so precisely with the views which the Opposition hold upon this subject that I have taken the liberty of quoting it to the House.

The Premier's Proposition Historically, and in fact, untrue.

When the hon. the Premier stated that if a particular trade or industry were to be fostered it could only be done at the expense of some other trade or industry, he made an assertion which he will pardon me for saying is unsupported by argument or proof. The hon. gentleman will therefore pardon me if, in answer to that assertion, I make a counter-assertion if I declare that it is historically and in fact, untrue. It is not true that in England during the period which terminated at the adoption of what is termed the free trade policy, the fostering of her great industries or manufactures which were fostered by the Government with all the ability that was within the competence of the Government—which were fostered by heavy protective duties, in many instances by actual prohibition of imports—which were fostered by export bounties, and in every other possible way—it was not true, I say, that the success of the manufacturing industry was brought about at the expense of the mining industry, or of the agricultural industry or of any other great industry of that country. But it is true, contrary to the assumption—the false assumption unsupported by proof—made in the hon. the Premier's proposition that during all that period of the growth under the fostering care of the Government of the manufacturers in England and in consequence of that growth and by reason of it, agriculture prospered more than it had ever done before. It is equally true that commerce then prospered there more than it had ever done before. It is equally true that the mining industry prospered more than it had ever done before, and that all the great industries of the country the