

losing at that time. That was just before an election, but when the election was over, and they had secured Algoma and the other iron regions of the province, they were satisfied, and they have not repeated the experiment of bonusing since. If it be wrong for the Dominion to encourage the industries of the maritime provinces, it is equally wrong for my hon. friend's party to do the same in the province of Ontario. I do not, however, hold that it is wrong. For once, at least, Sir Oliver Mowat and his cabinet did right, and I can only regret that they did not continue their action as I hoped they would.

We were informed by the hon. gentleman opposite, that the reduction of the duty on cottons, woollens and iron would only have a temporary effect in the reduction of the revenue, but that ultimately it would give us a surplus. On that principle we ought to remove the duties altogether; that would in his opinion be much the better way. Free all the articles that are imported into the country from duty, and if the people can get the money to buy them we shall have good times and a surplus; but the misfortune would be, that our population would have no employment and consequently no money to buy with, and the revenue would fall off tremendously. But did my hon. friend, when he was in the government, adopt the policy of reducing the rate of duty when deficit after deficit came upon his party? Did they reduce the tariff in order to increase the revenue? Not at all, that eminent financier of the party with whom the hon. gentleman is still allied—a member of the same government—came down to Parliament with a proposal to raise the tariff all around, not to reduce it; and of course his proposal was hailed as one of those magnificent strokes of statesmanship that astonish occasionally the financial world. The readjustment of the tariff of which we hear so much, was simply the adoption of the tariff of Sir Francis Hincks *holus bolus*, except that it was raised $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent all round. My hon. friend says that theirs is a tariff for revenue only, but the argument which my hon. friend opposite is advancing is, that if you want to get more money you ought to reduce the duties on certain articles. In rebuttal of that argument I say that that was not the policy followed by the hon. gentleman when he was in power himself. The record shows that

his party acted in a manner diametrically opposed to the principle which they are now advocating—they raised the duty all round. I leave this argument for him to wrestle with and hope he will be equal to the task of reconciling what he is now advocating with what his party practised when they were at the head of affairs.

The hon. gentleman said that he could not join my hon. friend from Pictou in wishing me a long occupation of this seat. I am quite in accord with the hon. gentleman in that respect. I have no desire or particular ambition to occupy the responsible position that I do to day, but I trust the day is far distant when somebody holding the same views and opinions that I do and that the party to which I belong holds, may have to vacate it for those who are now in Opposition. It is not a question with the Conservative party as to the individual who may occupy this or any other position, but it is the great principles by which we are guided and which we believe will lead this country to a prominent position of which we may be proud. The only hope I have is that no matter who may form the administration, they may be men holding the same views and following in the footsteps of our illustrious predecessors, Sir John Macdonald, Sir John Abbott and Sir John Thompson, and the result will be not only that the country will prosper but that it will occupy a position in the world second to none. It is all very well to tell us that the great wealth of this country is its agricultural products. We admit all that, but the hon. gentleman forgets to look at the statistics and to tell this country what they prove. I am not going into them minutely, but if he will examine them he will find that a home market has been produced and maintained to such an extent as to provide a market for the produce of the farm, and it has doubled, trebled and quadrupled our exports of the products of the farm. Look at the figures that I gave to this House last year, and you will find an extraordinary increase in many products. I refer particularly to the product of the hog. Whereas we imported some 14 or 15 million pounds of that product for home consumption, last year it fell to about 4 million pounds, while the exports of the product of the hog had risen from 4 to 5 millions to 14 or 15 millions of pounds. That is but one illustration of the effect of protection to the farmers of this country and of the