

Toronto in 1870 was, he believed, simply the refuse of a small quantity which had arrived in Upper Canada during the previous year. In 1871, the National Policy was somewhat rudely challenged. On the motion to read the Customs Bill of that year a third time tomorrow, the Hon. Mr. Holton moved, seconded by Mr. Mills, an amendment repealing the duties on coal, coke, wheat and flour. Mr. Blanchet, seconded by Mr. Ryan (Montreal), then moved "that salt, peas, beans, barley and other cereals be added to the terms of the foregoing amendment." That was carried by 102 to 28; all the Ministers voted with the majority. He supposed no great fault could be found with those gentlemen; no great inconsistency charged against them for voting for an amendment to an amendment, which, if carried, might have defeated the object of the original amendment. It was a little piece of parliamentary strategy on their part, in the hope that by adding these articles to the former resolution, the whole would be voted down. That was perfectly true, and he desired to make the remark because it was quite possible he might again be misconstrued if he omitted to do so. On the same occasion, the hon. member for Ottawa moved a resolution entirely repealing the duty on pork. He would give another amusing illustration of the inconsistency of supporters of a National Policy. The amendment as thus amended—that was to say with Mr. Blanchet's amendment added to the original one—was carried by 83 to 55; 31 of the majority being supporters of the Government. Deducting the 31 Ministerialists from the majority and adding them to the minority, it would give the Government a majority of 34, a pretty convincing proof, he thought, that the National Policy, so far as the action of the House was concerned, was deliberately repealed, not by the members of the then Opposition, but by the Conservative party. All the Ministers who were present voted on that occasion with the minority. On the motion for the third reading of the Bill, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. M. C. Cameron) having moved to restore salt to the dutiable

list, Mr. Bowell, the hon. member for North Hastings, moved the following resolution:—

"That, in view of the negotiations now pending at Washington between the representatives on the part of the British Government and the United States, touching questions which may lead to a renewal of the reciprocity treaty, it is, in the opinion of this House, inexpedient to repeal the duties now imposed upon certain articles enumerated in section two of the Bill as amended; be it therefore resolved that the Bill be not read a third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of expunging all the words between 'coke' and the words 'as herewith repealed,' in section two of the said Bill."

The effect of this would have been to repeal the duties on coal and coke, but to retain all the other duties as they were imposed in the year 1870. The House divided on Mr. Bowell's motion, which was lost; the yeas being 38, and the nays 110. In the majority were 57 Ministerial supporters and every member of the Government in the House. In other words, the final death-blow to the National Policy was given by a House in which, had party lines been observed and hon. gentlemen chosen to tax the allegiance of their followers, they might have sustained it by a majority of forty-two. That was the party which, at this moment, held a national policy to be necessary to our national existence. After some other motions, the Bill was read a third time and the National Policy finally extinguished. Coming back once more to high authority, he would quote what appeared in the *Toronto Leader*, on the 23rd of March, the day after the first blow had been struck at the National Policy. The *Leader* said:

"We must, therefore, express our unfeigned satisfaction that the sense of the House has been so unmistakably pronounced in favour of the abolition of duties, and that the exploded theory of protection receives such little favour in the High Court of Parliament."

Another paper, perhaps equally influential—the *Montreal Gazette*—did not give so much as a squeak or a groan over the decease of the National Policy. Now, it had been said on several occasions that the action of the House at that time was to embarrass the course of events