ada

hich

d to

reat

nost

ad-

and

lone

ined

hod.

ent,

rea-

only

ers,

xact

e in

ling

for

yed

tern

y be

?ro-

s of

st at

 ${f The}$ 

and

ari-

hey

hey

the

aut-

s of

tec-

iffiing

It must not be imagined however that irreconcilable demands. the other Provinces could be satisfied with any plan adopted, for on the contrary, Quebec had many reasons for joining with the Maritime Provinces in opposing concessions to Ontario, and had also special demands of her own. As for British Columbia, she too was dissatisfied with the tariff, although it would not seem that her representatives laid so much stress upon this as upon the alleged bad faith of the Dominion Government in not completing the construction of the Pacific Railway, in the movement which they now made for the repeal of the Union. The opponents of the Protectionists were not generally absolute Free Traders, but differed from the upholders of the National Policy as to the objects of imposing duties upon importations, and as to the extent The supporters of the National Policy of such imposition. claimed that duties should be imposed, not only for the purpose of raising a revenue, but also to foster the struggling industries of the colony, to favor home productions, and to prevent foreign manufacturers and producers from competing with the manufacturers and producers of Canada. They claimed that their motives were purely patriotic, and they insisted that those among the Canadians who were not manufacturers or producers, or who would in any way suffer by the adoption of the policy, should be willing to make some sacrifice, on patriotic grounds, and that in the end they would be gainers by the general prosperity which, some how or other, would certainly ensue.

The adversaries of the scheme, on the other hand, contended that the imposition of duties was only justifiable on the ground that a revenue must be raised to defray the expenses of government; and they contended further, that a very large class in the community could not in any way be benefited, and would certainly be injured by protection, and they objected in the strongest terms to legislation which was only calculated to enrich a limited number of persons at the expense of their neighbors. They also argued that, owing to the prevailing depression, buyers would be obliged to curtail their purchases of all articles, especially those subject to heavy duties, and that, as a consequence, there