

est themselves in public affairs and see the depression of trade, the commercial stringency, and the depletion of the treasury, look to a change of tariff as the salvation of the country. We are told that a cheap country is the place to live in, and the best to attract immigration. My opinion is that such a country is the poorest, and that the emigrant will not go there. The emigrant is attracted by a demand for labor and high wages. Take the United States, for instance. Is that a cheap country—which means a poor country? The protective system prevails there with its consequences—high wages. Yet no other country attracts more emigrants, from the unskilled hand to the skilled artizan. We have been told that a cheap country is the place to live in, and to attract immigration. My opinion is it is the poorest and least attractive to emigrants, who look for employment and high wages. The United States is not a cheap country, which is only another name for a poor country. Protection prevails there, and there is remunerative employment for the unskilled hand the skilled artizan. If the policy of the Government is to continue, the money expended for immigration purposes can well be saved, for with no Pacific Railway and no employment in manufacturing industries, we should discourage emigrants from settling in Canada. Now, I contend we should encourage all natural branches of industry which are likely to flourish in this country, and in time challenge competition from all countries. That is the true policy to develop our country's growth. Political economy is a great science, but should be modified to suit the exigencies of a country. Free Trade, under existing circumstances, is impracticable, and reciprocity is a delusion. Our neighbors have used us to foster their industries, and will continue to do so until we act independently of them and adopt a national and domestic policy. As regards the Pacific Railway, it appears to me that this Government have not done what the country would expect from them. They say they have not completed the location of the line, and therefore they cannot go on. The Secretary of State in the general election of 1874, stated that neither this Government nor the next, nor many future Governments, would build the road. This seems not to be quite consistent with their Minute-in-Council confirming the award of Lord Carnarvon, to build the road in fifteen years. The Esquimalt and Nanaimo bill came up in Parliament, and two members who were then supporters of the Government voted against it and the railway policy of the Government, but they were

afterwards taken into the Cabinet, as they declared themselves, on their own terms. In this House the bill was defeated by the votes of two Government supporters, one of whom was afterwards rewarded with a commission. If the Government were sincere in their desire to build the Pacific Railway, they would not reward those who opposed their policy. The present Minister of Justice in his Aurora speech declared British Columbia was a sea of inhospitable mountains, and that the Pacific Railway was an impracticable scheme. Subsequently he came into the Cabinet, whose declared policy was to build the road. There is some inconsistency, to say the least, in all this. It is evident, from what we hear, that there is a deficit in the revenue. We know there is a depression in trade, which has lasted for some time, and yet the Government have not noticed it in the Speech, or taken any steps to meet the difficulty. We find from the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1876 there has been a decline in the aggregate trade of the Dominion of \$21,805,983. The imports from the United States amounted to \$46,170,033, while the exports to that country were only \$20,916,876, showing an excess of imports amounting to \$16,053,157, which balance against us we are obliged to pay in gold. When the late Government were in power, the balance of the trade was in our favor. It is evident we must have some readjustment of the tariff to prevent our foreign trade and our home industries from being destroyed. The Government appears indifferent to all this. The country holds them responsible for their share in the evils that exist since they took power and will soon call on them to make way for able men—for true Reformers. Under the late Government there was a balance of trade in favor of this country. In 1872 there was a decided balance in our favor. I hope the Government are taking steps to prevent the money of Canada from drifting out of it. Unless this is done we cannot build our Pacific Railway. It seems to me, however, that the Government would be recreant to their principles of Free Trade—which with them means free to buy but not to sell—if they increase duties. What they may properly do is not for us to say, but it is evident and well known that Protection has done much to build up the prosperity of the United States. During the civil war the branches of trade were broken up, and they had to recommence with a treasury almost bankrupt and all their invested resources destroyed. We find they have paid off in seven years \$427,000,000 of