

in an especially depressed condition. If our sadly long list of bankrupts was examined it would be found that manufacturers were not among the more numerous sufferers. In Montreal, the best houses as a rule belonged to the manufacturers, not to the merchants; and another very curious thing in connection with this was the fact that many, if not most, of our manufacturers were American citizens, who had left their own country, where they had all the supposed advantages of protection, and had established themselves in this comparatively free trade country, of their own free will and accord. Moreover, they were making fortunes, and every year adding to their plant.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL asked if any printers had failed?

Hon. Mr. PENNY said if they had not it was because they were tougher than others, for they certainly had a very hard time in this world, for which he hoped they would some day get credit. He thought again it was by no means certain that the United States had benefited by their fiscal system to the extent that some honorable gentlemen had mentioned. It was known as a matter of fact that a very large number of work people had left the United States.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—Does the honorable gentleman argue that the shutting up of the sugar refineries has not injured the direct trade with the West Indies and South America?

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he was not practically acquainted with that, and he would say nothing about it. He had been told by a gentleman interested in the woollen manufactures of the New England States that protection to woollens and wool had ruined that business. Again he might mention this significant fact, that when he left Philadelphia last fall he had brought with him one newspaper containing 218 notices of Sheriff's sales in that city alone. He was quite sure there was no city in this country in which there could be made such a disastrous exhibition.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD said when he was in Philadelphia he saw one of the papers there with 1,000 notices of sheriff's sales in it. That was in July last.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—Yet this was the sort of prosperity they were asked to take part in. He did not pretend that this state of depression in the United States was due entirely to their protective tariff; but it showed that protection had not been productive of that uniform prosperity which it was absurdly supposed to give. The United States had not been saved from collapse by protection; but it had flourished, and would flourish again, in spite of fiscal follies. How

could it be otherwise? Look at the many millions of railway loans that had come into it. Look at the vast immigration. Why, in twenty years, a continent that would have taken, in other ages, five hundred years to open up, had been, by the help of modern science, run over and rummaged in every corner. Gold, silver, coal, petroleum, all things of great value, had been skimmed off the surface, while on the older continents they had to obtain these things at vast cost and labor.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—Would that have been the case had there been no manufactures?

Hon. Mr. PENNY—These things were not affected, except disadvantageously, by protection on manufactures. And to obtain these, they would have secured the immigration necessary for the purpose, if the manufacturing immigration had been less, which was a question admitting of discussion. He held there was no panacea of a legislative kind to make people prosperous. Many countries had thriven more or less under bad systems. England was prosperous under protection, as compared with other nations of less activity and resources, but not prosperous according to her own means and resources. All great English statesmen of the last century, to whom the world now looked up, commencing with Shelbourne and Pitt, were free traders; and Lord Beaconsfield, who perhaps might be said to have made his reputation by his attacks on Peel's free trade policy, had soon changed his views, and declared that the free traders were right.

Hon. Mr. RYAN—Where has he expressed that?

Hon. Mr. PENNY said he had expressed it by not changing the policy of the country when he had had the power. Attempts had lately been made to obtain something in the way of protection to sugar, and the Government had refused it, which would be taken as an expression of the belief that protection was not a wise policy. If ever there was justification for it it was in this case, when the French were sending their sugars in the way they were doing under their drawback system. Now, he asked what was the inducement which it was expected to hold out to emigrants as a consequence of this so-called national policy? Could we expect by such a policy to bring hither an immigration of the artizan class? In England, at the present time, wages for mechanics and artizans were as high as they were in Canada, and the cost of living was cheaper there than anywhere else in the world. It could not be expected that people so situated could be induced to come