

to see the point of the argument which he has adduced. He accused the hon. Finance Minister of want of consistency, because he asserted on some former occasion that the Tariff was to be permanent in all its details, and that it would be the means of introducing foreign capital. I am quite sure the hon. Finance Minister never said one word to intimate that the Tariff was to be permanent in all its details, or anything beyond the fact that the policy of Protection was to be maintained. It has always been intimated that the Tariff was to be a flexible Tariff—it was necessary that it should be so, and that it should accommodate itself to the variations and wants of the trade; and I am sure that every supporter of the Government on the platform and elsewhere, at the last Election, declared that such was the policy of the Government on that subject. Then as to the want of candor, I fail to see wherein it consisted. What has all this wordy discussion amounted to? What we want to know is whether it is desirable to endorse the proposals of the Government and to vote for the increase by way of bounty of the protection given to manufacturers of pig iron. That is the point before us. To speak on what was asserted on former occasions, or to play on words as to whether this was said or not, is wasting the time of the House. So far as regards the advantage and necessity of the proposed increase, I am prepared to support it, and I would not be doing my duty to my constituents if I did not support it, not only by my vote, but also by my voice. Since the introduction of the policy of Protection the iron interest in my own constituency has been investigated by capitalists, all, or nearly all, Americans, who came there and examined the iron deposits, and considered the subject of erecting smelting works. They have exported, and are exporting some of the ore in a crude state; but they saw an opportunity of manufacturing iron on the spot, which we all know is infinitely more advantageous to the country and to the particular district in which it is carried on, than is the exportation of the crude ore. Before the last Election they were considering the subject. They, however, read the *Globe*, and they asked the question whether this policy was to be permanent or not. They understood that the permanency of the policy depended on whether the Government continued in power after the Elections. They made representations to the Government, and hon. members who are interested in developing the iron interests, made representations either verbally or in writing—I made them both in writing and verbally—that \$2 a ton on pig iron is not adequate to induce the introduction of foreign capital for the manufacture of pig iron in Canada. The Government said they would consider those representations, as the hon. member for West Durham sneeringly said, they would consider a question regarding a remote harbor in Nova Scotia; they declared it was an important subject, and one which required due regard to be paid to every interest, the interest of the consumer as well as of the manufacturer. It being understood that the Government had these representations under consideration, the Americans continued to turn their attention to the subject; and during my election I met American gentlemen who proposed to put up smelting works in my county; and they assured me that unless the present Government were returned they would not put one dollar into the enterprise, and they awaited the result of those Elections before they continued their preparations and invested any considerable amount of money. They commenced preparations beforehand, believing the Government would be sustained; but at the same time they said: "We are doing this in the expectation that the Government will perceive that \$5 per ton is not sufficient protection, and either, by way of additional duty or bounty, will increase the protection given to manufacturers of iron; and if they do so we will go into it heartily, and place a large amount of capital in the manufacture of pig iron." And they have done so. They have put up smelting works

there and given employment to a large number of people. They have bought all the cordwood they could obtain—because they are going to make charcoal iron—from the halfstarving settlers on the rocky lands in the northern part of my county, which wood they could not dispose of, and which they would have had to burn in order to cultivate the soil. They are buying all the cordwood they can team to the works. This enterprise has introduced labor in every direction. A large village has sprung up at the place, and farmers can sell their potatoes, vegetables and poultry to the men who are there now, whereas formerly there was no market. It has introduced quite an era of prosperity into what otherwise was a very poor district, and likely never to go ahead and prosper. I say, therefore, it is the duty of the House to lay aside special pleadings as to whether the hon. gentleman made certain statements on former occasions, or whether their words can be twisted in this direction or that, and to consider the important question before the House, whether the passage of this resolution is calculated to advance the best interests of the country at large.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think either the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), or the hon. Finance Minister, is warranted in charging the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) with want of candor. I would ask the hon. Finance Minister if he is prepared to assert that there was anything in his language in relation to the iron industry which could warrant the country in believing that he intended to increase the duty 50 per cent., and that he would make a flank movement as he has done in this case, and place the duty in the form of a bonus, and tax the country for the benefit of the iron interest. I maintain that the people were not informed as to the policy and intention of the Government when they went to the polls at the last Election. I maintain that the people were deceived, and that the Government did not prepare the people for the announcement of the policy now made in connection with the iron industry. We have every reason to believe, from the assertions made by the hon. Finance Minister, that this is but the entering wedge, and that he may, even yet, advance the duty on pig iron to \$7 per ton, as he tells us manufacturers desire him to do. That hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks a few moments ago, drew the very glowing picture of the benefits which the granting of bonuses were going to confer on the country; that the result would be to put thousands of men at mining ore and producing iron—I took down the hon. gentleman's own words, and these are his exact words. I understand that the importations of pig iron, not manufactured, last year, amounted to 63,000 tons. The utmost he can hope to accomplish is to produce in Canada the whole quantity of iron imported from abroad. How many thousands of men will be employed, supposing the product is 63,000 tons?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There are 1,100 people employed by the Londonderry works, which produced 15,000 tons last year.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see, by referring to the United States statistics, that the average production of pig iron is 112 tons per man in the blast furnaces. According to that proposition, an output of 62,000 tons would give employment to 552 men, and the men employed in mining coal and other work might be as many more. The utmost number, therefore, that could be employed would be 1,500. And the country at large is to be taxed to the amount of \$94,500, in order that we may employ 1,500 men. The hon. gentleman can easily figure out how much per head this country will have to pay for that privilege. The assertion made by him that the granting of this bounty would be the means of giving employment to thousands of additional men is a specimen of the broad, unwarranted assertions made by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the advantages