

there were certain causes why protection was pushed up over this unwritten law, and brought into the arena of fruitful discussion. Yes, there were. My hon. friend would not have to go far to find them, he would find a number of them sitting close to himself. If my hon. friend will reach out his left hand about two feet from himself, he will find one of those disturbing causes, for I believe it is on record that in 1877, Mr. Joly, M.P., declared :

The admission of grain free of duty is against the interests of the farmer of Canada, and I am decidedly in favour of protection for the home markets of this country.

Now, if my hon. friend will reach out his right hand about two feet he will strike another one of those impelling motives of that early time, for at that period, in 1871, the Hon. Mr. Laurier declared :

It is humiliating to have to admit that after the existence of three hundred years, this country is not able to supply its own wants. Although nature has been marvellously prodigal in her gifts, and has done so much to make this a manufacturing country, we are yet dependent on foreign countries. It is our duty to foster our national industries.

And in 1876 another impulse was given by the same Mr. Laurier who declared :

It is asserted by many, and assumed by others, that free trade is a Liberal principle and protection a Conservative principle. If I were in Great Britain, I would be a free trader ; but I am a Canadian born and a resident here, and I think that we require protection. We have within ourselves the ability to create an industry. If it is shown that we cannot maintain it, unless by legislation, either in the way of premium or prohibitory tariff, then I should be ready to take that into consideration.

And if he will turn to the seat behind him he will find another one of those impelling causes, who, in 1876, in the person of Mr. Wm. Paterson, M.P., declared :

The Administration should protect our agricultural interests. Such a duty would not bear in any way upon the consumers and would be of great advantage to the interests concerned. The small duty upon grain would benefit the farmers of this country. It is well known that we pay a bonus to the inhabitants of other countries to come into Canada and settle in our midst. I believe, by a defensive tariff that you would not have to pay to bring those men here. Adopt it, and you will find that the steam whistles of our factories will be the call for them to come. The other year, the Finance Minister, in revising our tariff, gave some encouragement to one industry which it never had before. The result was that one thousand men who were engaged in that industry in Germany, were literally transported by the change in the tariff to Canada and set to work here. The cost of the article was not increased one iota, and Canada got all the benefit.

He will find another of those impelling causes sitting over to his right several seats away, in the person of Mr. John Charlton, M.P., who, in 1876, declared :

I believe the agricultural interests would be benefited by protection. I would make a market

Mr. FOSTER.

by bringing the manufacturer to the door of the farmer. The home market is of the greatest value.

How often it happens that an historical reminiscence flies back into one's family and plays mischief therein. My hon. friend thought he was contributing something for the information of the Liberal-Conservative party. What was he doing ? He was giving an opportunity to show that the brightest minds in his own party at that time were impressed with the National Policy, the intellectual and moral element which take their ground and tone from the trend of public opinion and in the halls of Parliament represent the quality of that trend. I have not the least doubt in my own mind that the National Policy victory of 1878-79 was due to the help the old line Liberal-Conservative party got, if not from the votes of those men, from their teachings and their followers in the Liberal party. And yet, we, forsooth, are to be lectured by this new Minister of Finance because there were certain conditions from 1871 to 1876 which operated to impel the people of Canada and the statesmen of Canada on to that ruinous road of protection to our home industries.

Well, Sir, after that reminiscence was over, the hon. Minister of Finance went on to declare that the National Policy had resulted in bitter disappointment and in utter failure. I noticed when he made that statement he received no cheers from the back benches, and I felt such a throb of sympathy in my heart for him that I made an appeal to some hon. gentlemen to cheer, and we had to keep up the spirits of the Finance Minister as best we could by applauding him on the other trends of his argument. He then went on to show the reasons that had acted as an inducement to the adoption of the National Policy, and how illusory they were. First, it was that infant industries should be for a time temporarily assisted. But he declared that the argument was without force because when the infants grew up they still called for the bottle as lustily as when they were at the mother's breast. The hon. gentleman does not seem to have grasped the idea of the changed conditions. The National Policy in the methods of its working, in giving protection at the start, gave a protection which was sufficient to afford our industries vantage ground against competition whatever it was at that time. If ten years afterwards the competition were ten times as keen the very principle of protection would demand that the vantage ground should be a little stronger entrenched in order to keep the industry, grown up or not, on the same vantage ground as regards the strong and merciless competition of trade from other countries all over the world. The second inducement was with a view to secure reciprocity with the United