

increased accommodation necessary. The Harbor Commission wished to raise funds to make improvements, and as the people of Quebec were unanimous in desiring this measure, he hoped it would be allowed to pass.

Hon. Mr. RYAN said the petitions to which he had referred were before the House. They had never been withdrawn, and he had to assume they expressed the views of the gentlemen who had signed them. Of course, there might be private letters to the contrary, but they were not officially before the House. The discussion would have produced a good effect if it would lead the Government to rectify the defects in the bill. He fully concurred in the principle laid down by the honorable Senator from Prince Edward Island with respect to the penalty imposed on pilots.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT promised to make enquiries as to whether the bill was to include lumber and timber from Ontario. If it was so intended, it would be very objectionable, as it would discriminate against that province.

The bill was read a second time on division.

#### THE NATIONAL POLICY.

Hon. Mr. REESOR resumed the debate on Hon. Mr. Read's national policy motion. He said he knew this question had been discussed at great length, but he felt that, rightly looked upon and fairly considered, it was one of the most interesting subjects they had had before the House this session. During a period of about twenty years there had been a system of duties imposed for revenue purposes that had been continued from one Government to another, and had been in a great measure uniform. It had been the understood policy, not only of the Government that first introduced that policy, but of the Finance Ministers who followed—Galt, Holton, Howland, Rose, Tilley and Hincks. During that period of twenty years the country had greatly developed and increased in prosperity, so that all parties began to look upon that as the settled policy of the country whether the duty was ten, fifteen or seventeen and one-half per cent., as long as it was sufficient to meet the wants of the country for revenue purposes, and was incidentally the means of protecting our industries and developing their gradual growth. The Finance Minister, speaking of the evidences of the increase of wealth and the development of the country, from 1868 to 1876, said:—

“The bank deposits in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, for which alone we have returns, have increased from \$29,689,-

000, to a no less sum than \$70,450,000, the absolute increase in that case being 130 per cent.; and the deposits in Government Savings Banks from \$1,686,000 to \$7,178,000, an increase of fully 400 per cent., the quantity of shipping owned and registered in this Dominion had increased 65 per cent.,—deducting from this estimate the outlying Provinces since added to the Dominion; and, although the gross volume of exports do not show equal additions, yet the exports of our own products from the four original provinces have grown from \$45,000,000 in 1867, to \$65,000,000 in 1877, exhibiting an increase in this direction of 45 per cent. In the first named year, Mr. Speaker, the total produce of the fisheries amounted in value to \$3,357,000, whereas during the last named year the exports from that source amounted to about \$5,250,000. The exports of articles from the forest amounted to about \$19,750,000 in 1876, as against \$18,250,000 in the first named year, this increase being very small, while the exports of animals and their products have risen from \$6,893,000 in 1868, to no less than \$12,305,000 in 1875. The exports of agricultural products during the same time advanced in value from \$12,871,000 to \$20,469,000; deducting, in all these cases, the exports of the provinces recently added to the Dominion from the calculations.”

He thought it was fair and reasonable when they considered the result of incidental protection—a principle of which he approved—as shown in this development of the country for the last twenty years, it was only reasonable to draw the conclusion that the policy that had been adopted and incorporated in the legislation of the country was the true national policy to which they should adhere. To depart from this system, and to adopt a policy of giving immense bounties to manufacturers, or putting on a prohibitory tariff for the sake of holding out unnatural inducements to abnormally developed manufactures, was not only an anti-British but an anti-Canadian policy, not calculated to advance the interests of the country. A great deal had been said in regard to the balance of trade—that if the balance of trade was against the country therefore the country must be suffering. He considered that was a fallacy. When a merchant sent out a cargo of 20,000 barrels of flour, worth \$100,000, and that flour realized \$7 per barrel in Liverpool, although the goods were shipped as being worth \$100,000, there was a profit realized to the country of \$40,000. Although this profit did not all fall into the pocket of the man who made the venture, it was divided between him and the