POOR COPY

you insist in shutting out her products you will get it all." All that has been changed, and Canada occupies a different ground to-day in relation to this matter. If hon. gentlemen opposite want an instance of increased trade, let them go to Montreal. Mr. Robertson, Port Warden of that port, says we have this year an increased revenue of $70,000 from the importation of coal from the Maritime Provinces, and the increased trade in sugar from the West Indies alone. They talked of the increased cost of sugar. I defy hon. gentleman to show that the policy has added a farthing to its cost, notwithstanding the increased price in the United States. The hon. gentleman talked of the duty on flour and coal which weighed so heavily on the poor man in St. John. Does the hon. gentleman know the whole duty on flour and coal in New Brunswick would not be three cents per annum per head of the population? And the same might be said of Nova Scotia. Did he not know that the duty on coal lowered the price in St. John.

Mr. Mackenzie—How?

Sir Charles Tupper—If the hon. gentlemen have not mastered that question they have not commenced the study of the question. If you give a mine a market that will enable it to work to a capacity of 100,000 tons, it can sell that coal cheaper at a larger profit and a smaller price than if it had but a market for that amount. (Hear, hear.) The sale of coal from the Maritime Provinces has largely increased during the past year. The duty of fifty cents would have accomplished the object of giving to the mines of Nova Scotia the markets of Ontario, and so far as the city of Toronto and Hamilton were concerned the coal was sold profitably there, but everybody knows that while there was a duty of 50 cents the price of coal during the past year fell to an abnormally low amount, and, therefore, the tariff had not as much effect as it otherwise would, and as it will have when the increased prosperity in the United States causes a rise in prices. The coal mining industry was, however, largely stimulated, an increase of 70,000 tons having been shipped to Montreal and Quebec, and without any increase in price. By putting on the additional ten cents, it is expected the coal from Maritime Provinces will be able to compete sharply with that of the United States. The late Minister of Finance wants to know what has been the effect of the National Policy. It would be impossible to develop the results of the policy of the Government in a day, a month, or a year. Every person knows that when a ship runs upon a rock, she cannot be immediately removed, though boarded by the ablest of seamen. The hon. gentleman knows that it is a truth in natural philosophy that the momentum is just in proportion to the magnitude of the moving body, and as Canada is a body of considerably magnitude, it was impossible at once to stop her downward progress and turn her on her proper course. But there is nothing I have ever witnessed in Canada with greater pride and pleasure than the fact that, notwithstanding this transitory state of our affairs, the people of Canada are strong in their confidence in the Government, and in their belief that although prosperity does not come in an hour, they will be wise in giving our policy a fair opportunity to develop itself. (Cheers.) It has developed itself already, and although I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, I have no hesitation in saying that it would be sustained by the people, and that hon. gentlemen opposite will never stand where I now stand until they change their policy. (Cheers.)

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's Speech.

Mr. MACKENZIE, on rising to reply, was greeted with cheers. He said:—My hon. friend from Centre Huron (Sir R. Cartwright) has good reason to be proud of this, that hon. gentlemen opposite have found it impossible to answer his arguments, and have put up their most abusive man to reply to him. (Cheers.) It is an enviable position. The hon. member for Cumberland (Sir C. Tupper) stands pre-eminent even among members on his own side for the sort of work he has accomplished so fully to-night.

ARGUMENT *vs.* ABUSE.

I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman in the use of strong language, but to endeavour by certain arguments to show that the position he has assumed is entirely untenable, and that my hon. friend has entirely justified the claims he set forth. In the first place, let me refer for a moment to the hon. the Finance Minister, against whose utterance I have nothing to say, like what I have said against his colleague. He was not, however, as candid or as fair as he ought to be, but that is a fault to which we are quite accustomed in hon. gentlemen opposite. (Cheers and laughter.) We do not expect them to be either fair or candid when such a course would prejudicially affect their position.

A PAIR OF "RENEGADES."

The hon. member for Cumberland reproached my hon. friend for being a "renegade Tory," and says that I acted very improperly in taking a renegade Tory into my Cabinet. I might characterize the hon. gentleman himself as a renegade free trader. (Cheers.) I might characterize the Minister of Finance as a renegade Reformer, ("hear, hear," and laughter), for I believe he was the leader of the Liberal party in New Brunswick for years. The hon. gentleman has changed his views, and I don't blame him for it if he has done so conscientiously. If he has gone conscientiously from light to darkness I give him credit, not for the intelligence displayed but for the step he has taken. (Laughter.) But if my hon. friend is to be denounced as a renegade because he has come from darkness to light, with how much more justice and severity may the hon. member be called a renegade for having gone from light into darkness. (Loud cheers.) The present leader of the Liberal party in England was for years a Conservative, but who thinks of raising the cry against Mr. Gladstone that the hon. member for Cumberland raises against my hon. friend. No man ever became a member of my Cabinet who was not entirely in accord with myself and the other members. In connection with the National Policy the hon. the Minister of Finance in part of his remarks endeavoured to point out the responsibility cast upon him by his predecessor in office, and said he was compelled on this account to secure an increased revenue so as to meet the additional expenditure he was compelled to make. The hon. gentleman who spoke last endeavoured to show that the Administration which I had the honour to lead was responsible for the engagement to construct great public works which added greatly to the annual expenditure.

THE FINANCE MINISTER MET WITH HIS OWN WORDS.

But in 1873 the Finance Minister—the same gentleman who now occupies the position—said:

"We have an annual surplus, after meeting all engagements and providing the necessary sinking fund, sufficient to pay the interest on a debt of $40,000,000 more than the debt now. We have in the present year a surplus, without taking into account the sinking fund, amounting to something like three quarters of a million. We are, however, entering upon new and increased engagements involving a very large sum of money; we are entering upon works—we have already done so—which will require a large increase of our debt; we have already undertaken to expend on the Intercolonial Railway; we have $30,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific, and the Canal System that has been accepted by the Government will involve an expenditure at least of $20,000,000."

These are serious matters, inasmuch as they add $60,000,000 to our existing debt. The late Administration modified this estimate. We declined to proceed with the whole of the canals. Work on the Welland Canal was in such a position that it had to be finished. The enlargement of the Lachine Canal was requisite for the requirements of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence trade. The combined Beauharnois and Morrisburg canals were not proceeded with. The Government determined to avoid every expenditure possible. Instead of acknowledging their responsibility, however, hon. gentlemen opposite with characteristic unfairness blamed the late Government for the necessity of these expenditures. If they had any fair play in their dispositions they would have assumed this responsibility, as the Finance Minister did in his speech years ago. The hon. the Minister of Railways says the late Government assumed the responsibility of the rapid construction of the Canada Pacific. Under the arrangement with Lord Carnarvon we assumed precisely what was assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite in that respect. That arrangement, as I said on a former occasion, was subject to declaratory Acts of Parliament and a resolution of this House not to increase the burdens of taxation for the purpose of proceeding with the work. Because we made a specific arrangement we are bound to that, while the deliberate bargain made by them to have the road completed in 1883 was not binding on them, I suppose. (Cheers.)

At this point Sir Leonard Tilley rose to leave the Chamber.

Mr. MACKENZIE—I hope the hon. the Finance Minister will not leave. I have something I desire him to hear. I want to read an extract from his own speech. (Laughter.) The hon. the Minister said in the same speech from which I have already quoted:

"Let us now consider for a moment whether, under the circumstances, we are likely to be able to meet this liability in the future without imposing heavy burdens upon the people of this Dominion. I would like to take you with me in imagination to that period ten years hence when the great Pacific Railway shall have been completed. (Cheers.) And I hope and trust, and firmly believe, that there is too much patriotism among us to allow any personal or political consideration to interfere with the progress of such a work as this, and I look upon its construction with as much confidence as upon any proposition made and accepted by this Parliament during the past five years."

I have to say this further regarding the expenditure upon this work, and I hope the hon. gentleman who has questioned me so closely will give me a little attention if he can spare time. He asks me if I would dare to say I did not purpose completing those sections of the road for which I asked tenders. I dare stand here and say that my Government were prepared to consider what they should do when tenders were received—particularly with regard to difficult sections in places where there was only a small population. They would be guided entirely by the capacity of the country to meet the expenditure. We asked tenders on two separate forms for the purpose of having exact information before we burdened the mass of people with a taxation which must ultimately be ruinous to the country.

SIR CHARLES *vs.* SIR CHARLES.

The hon. gentleman who spoke last said it was a most extraordinary doctrine to propound, that when heavy taxes were imposed the revenue does not benefit to a proportionate degree. But a few minutes afterwards the the hon. gentleman himself said that an additional duty of 10 cents was to be put upon coal. But the Government did not expect to derive a revenue from this source. There is a case in point. (Cheers and laughter.)

SIR LEONARD ADMITS MR. BURPEE'S STATEMENTS.

During the debate on the tariff last year, the hon. member for St. John proved conclusively—and his speech has never been refuted by the Finance Minister or any one else—that the tariff would impose an additional taxation of $7,000,000 upon the people, while now we have it admitted by the Finance Minister that only $1,000,000 has benefitted the Treasury. (Loud cheers.) Why, Sir, the very essence of the National Policy is this, that certain parties who are manufacturing goods are to be benefitted in order that the manufacture of these goods shall be confined to the country. The very essence of the policy is to benefit certain classes; and it is not denied by any one, but it is asserted by hon. gentlemen opposite, that while this is true, the stimulus it will give to native production, and the use which can be made of your agricultural products, will more than meet the tax laid upon the public in order to accomplish this object.

THE TRUE POLICY AND PRINCIPLE.

We on the other hand, say on this side, that the true policy is to distribute the taxation of the country on all classes alike, as nearly as possible, so that no particular class shall be overtaxed in order that another may be enriched at their expense—and I assure the Minister of Railways that if I never go back to that side of the House without changing my policy, as he has done, I will continue to sit here or go out of the House altogether. ("Hear, hear," and cheers.) When any one assumes the chameleon aspect of that hon. gentleman politically, it is time for him to cease talking of patriotism or high principle. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman seems to think it is an easy matter to change. Well, no doubt as he has passed through that operation so frequently his experience is valuable. ("Hear" and laughter.) But I would not advise any rising politician to follow his example, for it is pitiful to find an able man like him reduced to the degraded position in which he now stands. (Ministerial cheers and "Oh, oh!") The hon. gentleman, in the course of his denunciations, said that he and his friends were expelled from power by a misunderstanding. He said he thought the late Administration, which I had the honour to lead, was ignominiously defeated. I know of no ignominy connected with it. We fought the battle, whether we were right or wrong, on the broad line; we fought on principle; we took our stand on the ground that we would not impose additional taxation on the people in the circumstances in which the country was placed. We opposed a protective policy. On that principle we were defeated; but I am satisfied that at this moment, if the country had to pronounce on that question again, it would pronounce in our favour. (Hear, hear.)

CONDEMNATION OF THE N. P. IN ONTARIO.

The hon. gentleman himself and the Minister of Finance, although they have no connection with Ontario, as well as the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, and if I recollect rightly the Minister of Justice, sought to influence the Ontario elections. The hon. gentleman himself went to the strongest protectionist town in the Province, Hamilton, and although he used his best efforts there his candidate was defeated; and in Toronto, where the Minister of Finance showed forth the beauties of his new system, the majorities of 900 of six months before were reduced to 60. (Hear, hear.) Such was the effect of the hon. gentleman's presence there. The Premier himself also took part in the contest in Toronto, and the whole of the journals of the Conservative party took the ground that if the Liberal Administration of Mr. Mowat was sustained that was the end of the National Policy (hear, hear), that the National Policy would then be condemned by the great Province of Ontario. And it was condemned, and that condemnation sustained the local Premier and his administration beyond every other question that was discussed at the polls. ("Hear, hear," and "No, no.")

EXPENDITURE OF THE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

The hon. gentleman referred to the expenditure under the late Administration. Well, Sir, the actual expenditure for each year was as follows:—In 1873-4 under the Estimates of the present Minister of Finance, $23,316,000; in 1874-5, $23,713,000; in 1875-6, $24,483,000 1876-7, $23,519,000; and in 1877-8, $23 503,128. Now, Sir, while, except for the one year 1875-6, the expenditure is about the same as for the year 1873-4 we had imposed upon us during these years a very large additional outlay for which we were in no wise responsible, and the actual expenditure in 1876-7-8, instead of being 23½ millions, was not more than 21½ millions, we had vast increase of interest, in expenditure in the administration of justice in the North-West Territories under their own legislation, and in many other items which I will not speak of to-night. But these items left us with an actual expenditure in 1873-4 of two millions less than the hon. gentlemen opposite were responsible for in that year. The Minister of Finance announced to-night, as a means of meeting the expenses for the coming year, that he proposed to use the balances now in his possession to the extent of about six millions, and that he proposed to issue Dominion notes to the extent of eight millions.

FINANCIAL KITE-FLYING.

Now, Sir, it appears to me that there is a cash reserve to meet the issue of notes of something over three millions, and the hon. gentleman proposes to have just three millions of cash to meet the payment of twenty millions. (Hear, hear.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY—Twenty-five per cent in gold.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Not at all. Only 15 per cent in gold. (Hear, hear.) There is a famous financier in Hamilton, in the employ of the Government, who in his original scheme for paper money, made his currency notes which were to be redeemable in paper coloured yellow, in order to resemble gold as much as possible. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman intends to have 15 per cent in gold, and 18 and 10 per cent in yellow paper, I suppose. (Renewed laughter.)

Sir L. TILLEY—No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Well, the hon gentleman has not told us how he proposes to utilize this money. Does he intend to pay it to the contractors? Is it to be paid through the contractors' coffers for wages to workingmen? Is it to be issued through the banks, or are the banks to take it; and we are expected to receive these without any intimation of this kind, and our whole financial system is to be overturned to meet the exigencies of the Government? The hon. gentleman may depend upon it that he will not be able by this means to do anything else but derange the currency of the country and sap the ends of credit in the country.

FACING BOTH WAYS.

I was a little amused, Sir, to hear the hon. gentlemen speak about imports and exports. Both seemed to think that it was a matter to rejoice over that the imports were materially lessened. Now the lessening of the imports of a country shows the poverty of the country, and the increase of the exports sometimes also shows the poverty of the country. Now I do not say that the ordinary views with regard to the balance of trade which prevail in England are applicable to the same extent here; but they are in kind. But we know from a high authority the position that hon. gentlemen take who have some knowledge of financial matters. In 1873 the present Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech spoke as follows:—

"Here we have something like $12,000,000 a year excess of imports over exports, the interest on the debt of the Dominion, payable in London, is $4,000,000 more, and we have $16,000,000 a year to be provided for, which our exports do not appear to cover. But if we look at the matter more carefully, we will arrive at the conclusion—and the just conclusion—that there are no good grounds for apprehension. Of course the matter can only be approximately estimated, but I have taken some pains in the matter, and taking one city in the Dominion as an illustration, I find that in the case of the city of St. John—the city I make the honour to represent in this House—I find a very careful examination made by the President of the Board of Trade, it appears that the return freights from that city amount to $2,000,000 a year, and it may be the case in the city of St. John we may safely estimate that from $5,000,000 to $6,000,000 of profit from freights are received every year, by which the surplus, as between imports and exports is very materially reduced. If we go further and take into consideration the expenses incurred in the shipping of the produce of the Dominion, which amounts to $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 a year, for which disbursement bills of exchange are drawn, we shall find that these two items alone are sufficient to make up the difference."

It will be seen from this extract that the hon. gentleman has completely changed his views.

Sir L. TILLEY—The balance is so much more to our credit.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Yes: I suppose that the less our imports are, we are so much richer.

KILLING OUR FOREIGN TRADE.

The hon. gentlemen opposite by their protectionist policy have set themselves deliberately to reduce and destroy our foreign trade. I believe that no country possessing, a fleet of vessels, no country having commercial relations with the world, can avoid having a foreign trade. Because the Americans have ceased to have a foreign trade, they have sunk in the scale of nations. They have fallen behind the age, because they have no means of exchanging commodities with the rest of the world. The idea seems to be possessed by hon. gentlemen opposite, that they can require every one who buys from them to buy at their own prices, while they are also compelling them to sell what they have to sell at their own prices too. Now, Sir, I believe—and all the enlightened traders of the world believe—that the true method is to sell that which is most easily produced to those who produce another commodity which that nation requires, and one of the most disastrous results of a protection-ist policy is, that it destroys our foreign trade and builds up monopolies. (Hear, hear.) To be sure the remedy will come.

UNFULFILLED PROMISES.

The hon. gentleman thinks there can be no change of Government in this country until everyone becomes a protectionist. Now, I believe that the policy of the hon. gentleman has proved a disastrous failure. The statement of the Finance Minister to-night is one that any country might be ashamed of, especially those who proclaimed so loudly that when a change of Government took place, a return of prosperity would immediately come about that very moment everybody would be employed; that bank stocks would rise and everything show an increased prosperity. But the fact was that from the day the Government went into office to the time of harvest an increased depression took place, bank stocks fell, business failures multiplied, and there was every sign of the deepest distress, and the hon. gentleman and his party were only saved from utter political destruction by the good crop with which we were blessed. (Hear, hear.) But even that, Sir, would not have saved them it there had not been a failure of crops in Europe, which necessitated the purchase of large amounts of grain on this side of the Atlantic. Yet they speak as if they had produced the high price of wheat. They taxed everything that enters into the cost of living, everything in fact that they could lay their hands on, and thereby of course the cost of living—they even put a tax on wheat—was increased. But they had no influence on the price of wheat in this country. Everybody knows that the ultimate market for wheat is England, and that we were only the carriers. From one end of the country to the other, the result of their policy, I repeat, is disastrous. Even the revenue has shown a great deficiency. The hon. gentlemen tried to make out that he had only a deficiency of $500,000. But notwithstanding the cooking of accounts which the hon. gentlemen seems to understand so well, the fact is obvious to the country that there is a deficit of between one and two millions—which the hon. gentleman is responsible for. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman said with some indignation that we were damaging the policy of the Government and deceiving the country. Now, Sir, if the policy of this Government is wrong, this is just what we should do, and if the hon. gentlemen thinks we are damaging everything we believe to be right, he is mistaken. We are damaging it because we think it ought to be damaged; because we believe it to be a policy that will ruin the country, that the sooner it is put an end to the better; and if it is necessary to damage that policy in order to show its evil effects upon the commerce of the country why should we not do it? Are we to be deterred by idle threats from the Government benches from exposing the folly, the selfishness, and the utter failure of the policy which they inaugurated. The hon. gentlemen may depend on it that whatever happens we shall not cease to expose the fallacies which attach to their policy, and point out its evils to the country and to the world. The member for Cumberland took credit to the Government for the revival of the lumber trade.

THE N. P. AND THE LUMBERMEN.

During the tariff discussion last year several statements were made by the member for Queen's, N. B., which showed the amount of taxation imposed by the tariff on every thousand feet of lumber. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), who is a steadfast, but moderate supporter of the Administration, undertook to show that the hon. gentleman was mistaken; but even he made out that there was an additional tax imposed on the lumbermen. He admitted that, but he denied that it was so much as calculated elsewhere. I would like to know how it is possible for a policy to benefit the lumbermen which imposes an additional tax on them. By the admission of gentlemen on the Ministerial benches, that policy throws an obstruction in the way of lumbermen, and now the Minister of Railways says that obstruction has had the happy effect of increasing the prosperity of the lumbermen. The truth is, that any demand that has arisen for lumber has arisen from causes altogether unconnected with the National Policy. (Hear, hear.) The demand from England has increased for local reasons; the demand from the United States is likely to increase solely because they are enjoying there an increased prosperity which has not yet visited Canada.

SUGAR ETC.

The hon. gentleman says that the sun of prosperity shone brilliantly from the heavens immediately on the accession to power of himself and his colleagues, whom by the way he characterizes as the ablest men in the Dominion—as no one is better qualified than he to pronounce on such a question—("hear, hear, and laughter"). I say that the sun of prosperity has not yet touched our industries, except those which are excessively protected. Some of the cotton manufacturers and one sugar refiner have no doubt made a fortune at the public expense. (Hear, hear.) I venture to offer a challenge to the hon. gentleman. With reference to sugar he stated with that boldness which is characteristic of him that sugar is cheaper in Canada than in New York. I challenge him to produce the papers of New York containing current prices and those of Montreal containing prices in that city. I ask him to apply the duty imposed under the old tariff in New York and the cost of transportation, and compare the figures with the prices charged in Montreal, and he will find that the people of Canada have been paying during the whole year from ½c to 1½c per pound continuously more than they paid under the old tariff.

At this stage of Mr. Mackenzie's speech,

SIR JOHN MACDONALD suggested that the motion should now be carried, with the understanding that the leader of the Opposition should have the floor on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

The House then went into Committee of Ways and Means, and adopted the resolutions, which were reported.

Mr. MACKENZIE resumed his speech on the debate on the budget speech. He said the sugar legislation which the hon member for Cumberland was taking credit for the other evening, has been of an extraordinary character. I pointed out a few minutes ago—for I shall speak as if my remarks had not been interrupted by the adjournment of the House—and I challenge him to deny what I was saying that the price of sugar was considerably higher in Canada than in New York. In other words, if the old tariff had been applied to sugar during the last year we would have had sugar from New York at 1c to 1½c per pound every week lower than we have been paying the monopolists of Canada. (Hear, hear.)

* * * * * * *

The results of the last six months under the new tariff are, that we have imported 2,110,000 lbs. more than for the corresponding six months of the previous year, and the hon. gentleman has got one quarter of a million less revenue. And while this has been the case, the people have been paying higher prices for their sugar, while the money has gone, not into the coffers of the Government, but has been taken from the people and put into the hands of a few favored monopolists. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman actually boasted that their policy has created a class of people who had been scarce in Canada before; that they had now some millionaires in this country, as if it was a matter for boasting that their policy had made a few men excessively rich, while the bulk of the people were poorer than before.

DECEPTIVE CALCULATIONS.

The Finance Minister stated the other night that there was a decrease in the goods imported from the United States, to the extent, if I recollect aright, of thirty three per cent., while there was only a decrease of about 7 per cent, in the importations on British goods. This conclusion was arrived at from a manipulation of figures which is wholly indefensible, viz, by including certain free goods which are imported from the United States in large quantities, and basing his calculations on that fallacious foundation. Now, Sir, the real position of affairs is this:—There was a decrease of the imported goods from the United States upon which a duty of 18 per cent. was collected, while there was a decrease on goods imported from Great Britain on which a duty of only 15 per cent. was collected—a difference of 3 per cent., while the hon. gentleman made it appear that there was a difference of 26 per cent. This shows how unreliable are the statements of the hon. gentleman. But I will leave the details of that subject to be dealt with by other hon. gentlemen who will speak after me, while I shall devote myself to some other branches of the discussion.

DESCRIMINATING AGAINST BRITISH TRADE.

We see in another branch of trade what has been the effect of this tariff. In the last six months of 1878 there were imported of woollen goods into the country $4,420,257 in value, yielding a duty of $773,217; while during the corresponding six months of 1879 there were imported $2,984,153 worth of these goods, on which was collected duties amounting to $787,661. In other words, while the total value of such imported goods was reduced by over one-half, the duty collected was about the same. The average rate of dutiable goods imported from Great Britain in 1878, was correctly stated by the hon. gentleman at 19½ per cent., while those from the United States have increased from 12 per cent. to 15 per cent. Now the average upon dutiable goods from Britain, while it was 19½ before, is now 24½, an increase of 5 per cent.; while the average from the United States, which was before 22, is now 23, or an increase of only 1 per cent. So that I say that the hon. gentleman has discriminated against British trade, notwithstanding his professions of loyalty and devotion to the Mother Country, in the ratio of 5 to 1.

But the hon. gentleman promised that this matter should be rectified in his interview with some of the manufacturers of Manchester. If I mistake not, he promised that attention would be given to it in the then coming session. But, Sir, there has been nothing in his speech to indicate the slightest change, and we would have been led to suppose that the people of Great Britain were immensely pleased with his tariff, if one had not information from other sources. Indeed, the member from Cumberland appears to have been intensely gratified with the views of a member of the United States Embassy in London, who coincided with him as to the excellence of a protective policy. Well, Sir, this was to have been expected from the servant of a protectionist Government. It was quite natural that that gentleman should have expressed his concurrence in these views. But he failed to tell us that everywhere else there was a concurrence of opinion hostile to his views. The Minister of Finance called on this side of the House to substantiate the statement that there was great discontent in Great Britain at the policy pursued by the Government, and my hon. friend the member for Centre Huron pointed to Lord Salisbury's remarks as evidence of the strongest kind, coming as they did from the second man in the British Cabinet, regarding the course pursued by Canada—remarks in which he expressed the opinion that this policy would produce great discontent in England. And what was the reply to this. The hon. gentleman acknowledged that such a statement had been made by Lord Salisbury, but said, "Doesn't the member for Centre Huron know that Lord Derby, when confronted with a body of workingmen, told them that the only resource that he could recommend to them was to emigrate to America." What on earth has this to do with the question? (Hear, hear.) The mere fact that Lord Derby said something which did not affect Lord Salisbury's position, is no reply to the statement made by my hon. friend from Centre Huron, and if the hon. member for Cumberland had accompanied his absurd and preposterous statement of a comparison of the position of the two noble Lords by anything else than his characteristic vehemence, it would have been laughed at and ridiculed. (Hear, hear.)

THE UNOFFICIAL FINANCE MINISTER.

The hon. gentleman opposite was obliged to send Sir Alexander Galt to Belfast to apologise for his policy and to make a speech there, which the hon. gentleman didn't feel capable or willing to make himself.

Sir L. TILLEY—I was on the Atlantic.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Yes, but you were there before you went on the Atlantic, and knew that these people wished to see you. (Hear, hear.) Admitting, however, that the hon. gentleman did right under the circumstances, I can only say it is an exceedingly inconvenient arrangement to have a Finance Minister who doesn't occupy a seat in either branch of the Legislature. (Hear, hear.) How the hon. gentleman managed to make up his calculations as to the revenue for the year, is something I am now unable to perceive.

PECULIAR FIGURING.

He admits that while the revenue from July, 1877 to the first of March, 1878, was $15,032,742, that for the same period in 1879-80 was only $14,083,534. Yet he expects to bring up the revenue to the figure he mentions. If we apply the same principles of calculation that are applied elsewhere, as to the remaining part of the year we would only have reason to expect an additional revenue of something over six millions. And supposing we add a million to that for the purpose of making up for what extraordinary importations might take place under the peculiar circumstances, and we would have a total revenue, calculated by the hon. gentleman's own figures, of a little over twenty-one millions. The member for Cumberland laid great stress upon the fact that there had been several deficits, and he lectured my hon. friend beside me (Sir Richard Cartwright) as being a king of deficits. He discussed that subject as though there was something disreputable in having a deficit. Now, Sir, if there was a deficit, it was simply because the Government were unwilling to impose additional taxation during a time of deep depression of trade. But notwithstanding that depression, had values not fallen as they did, there would have been no deficit. (Hear, hear.) It was, therefore, clearly right that we should calculate to some extent upon the reanimation of trade, upon realizing better prices in future, and upon the natural rebound of the revenue. Under these circumstances it was right that we should not look upon a deficit as an insurmountable evil. Because, Sir, the money has to be provided in some way, and the only question that can possibly arise is this:

ABOUT DEFICITS.

Is it better for the Government to impose additional taxation, than to leave that amount to be an additional charge against the country in another shape? The country has to pay it in either case, and while I agree as a general principle that in the normal state of trade there should be no deficit, but a superabundant revenue, I can only say that under the circumstances, we adopted the best course that could be adopted. But the hon. gentleman was not content with denouncing the general existence of the deficit, although there was a gentleman sitting not far from him who had deficits amounting to twice the amount of our deficits during the few years he was in power before 1862. He ought, therefore, to have been more moderate in his denunciations of my friend. They instituted the policy of allowing deficits to occur when there was no depression of trade and no prospect of meeting them. We pursued the contrary policy, and if any Government was justified in allowing deficits to exist for a few years, we were. But the hon. gentleman was not content with denouncing the existence of deficits as a political, if not a moral wrong. He also grossly overstated the amount. I quite admit that it was not more overstated than things usually are by the member for Cumberland. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) We look for such overstatements from the hon. gentleman. He is always in excess of his figures. For instance, he stated the other night that I came into office with a majority of ninety at my back, which the hon. gentleman must have known was not the case. Now the hon. gentleman states that our deficits reached from eight to nine millions. Now, I will read to the House the exact statement of the deficits as they occurred. In 1875 there was a surplus of $975,644; in 1875-76 a deficit of $1,900,795; in 1876-77 a deficit of $1,460,027; in 1877-78 a deficit of $1,128,147; and in 1878-79 a deficit of $1,937,999. Although I include this last year, because we prepared the estimates for that year, hon. gentlemen opposite introduced a very large expenditure for which we were not at all responsible. But even if we assume the responsibility for all that expenditure our entire deficits amounted to $6,426,968. But we have to deduct the surplus of 1874-5, which leaves a net deficit of $5,491,324. From this again we have to deduct the amount which, during that time, we paid for the extinction of the debt, although it is invested otherwise at present. In other words, we paid into the sinking fund $4,090,064, which left our entire deficit for the period that we were in office, including the first half of the last year, just $1,401,360, while the hon. gentleman made it out in his extraordinary speech to be between eight and nine millions. (Cheers.) Now, Sir, when I am on the subject of finances let me deal with another subject. In the earlier part of my remarks I said that while we were able to keep our expenditure during our term of office down to a point very little higher than the amount of the last year for which the hon. gentlemen opposite took the estimates, that is 1873-4, there were other expenditures forced upon us by no policy of our own, which we were entitled to deduct, and I may say generally, that we kept within the estimates of the Finance Minister of 1873-4 in our expenditure for that year. (Hear, hear.) We spent $560,000, if I recollect rightly, less than the hon. gentleman estimated for. (Hear, hear.) But, Sir, in the last year for which we took estimates, 1878-9, when we were in office three and a half months, and the hon. gentlemen opposite eight and a half months, they not only did not keep within the limits of our estimates, but they expended a little over half a million more than our estimates covered. (Hear, hear.) And yet we are charged with that half million, as well as some other payments for which we have no responsibility whatever. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Now I propose to give some exact figures of certain services which were performed by us, which the Government preceding us did not perform, and which we reasonably must deduct from our total expenditure when comparing it with the expenditure of hon. gentlemen opposite.

(Continued on fourth page.)

Dwelling to Let.

The Subscriber is prepared to let or lease, for one or more years, the dwelling now occupied by her on St. John street, Chatham, together with garden and outlet buildings attached. The dwelling has been thoroughly repaired and is to be further improved by painting, etc., immediately.

Possession given first May.

Farm to Let.

Also—the farm at present leased to Wm. Sullivan, located on the Wellington road, about half a mile from the town of Chatham. If not let before the 15th of April, it will then be leased by Public Auction.

For further particulars apply to

MRS. ROBT. JOHNSTON, Jr.

To Let.

The well known business stand owned by the Subscriber, in dining store, shed and fishing privileges. Any one wishing to do country business, together with summer and winter fishing will find it the most suitable place.

Terms liberal.

For further particulars apply to.

Neguac, N. B., 26th Feb '80. V. ALLAN. 4m*

For Sale.

The farm situated on Burtibogue River, in the Parish of Alnwick, the property of James Kerr, containing 140 acres, fronting on the Burtibogue River 38 rods. There are 30 acres cleared when cut about 25 tons of hay. There is a dwelling house with a frost proof stone cellar, and 2 barns, one 40x40 ft. and the other 18x30 ft. The premises are supplied with both well and spring water. For terms apply to the Subscriber.

JAMES KERR.

Chatham, Feb. 16.

Farm for Sale.

The Subscriber offers for sale that valuable property with dwelling, barn and outbuildings, situate in Moorfield, opposite Chatham, containing about 70 acres, 20 acres of which are in good cultivation, the balance woodland. Possession given 10th April, next.

For further information apply to

JOHN McDONALD, Moorfield

A. D. SHLAGER, Chatham.

Moorfield, March, 5 '80. tf

To Let.

The dwelling house situate on the corner of Henderson and Duke street in Chatham.

Possession given on the 6 of May next. For further particulars apply to

JOHN HAVILAND, or A. H. JOHNSON.

Chatham, 9, of March, '80.

To Let.

The house and store on South side of Water Street, opposite the Golden Ball, lately occupied by W. H. Fresker.

Apply to

MARTIN LYONS,

Chatham, 28th Feb 1880. Mill Cove.

To Let or Sell.

The house at present occupied by Mr. A. Leishman situate on St John street, has a good Stone Wall cellar, wood-house attached and well of water on the premises.

ALSO:—

The House at present occupied by Mr. T. F. Keary, on same street, on the north side of the above, with similar conveniences.

ALSO:—

The House to the rear of these, on Cunard St., will be let (if required) in two tenements, good Water on the premises, Barn and Garden.

Possession of the above given 1st May.

F. J. LETSON.

Chatham, 17th March, 1880.

TO RENT.

FROM DATE, the store in the west end of the Canada House. For further particulars apply to the undersigned.

WM. JOHNSTON

Chatham, Nov. 20, 1879.

Miramichi Advance.

CHATHAM, ... MARCH 25, 1880.

Dominion Affairs.

We again surrender much of our space in order to give our patrons the benefit of reading the debate on the financial and general management of Canada, elicited by the estimates submitted by Sir Leonard Tilley to the House of Commons. Last week we gave the speeches of Sir Leonard and Sir Richard Cartwright. Sir Leonard's effort was, in part, that of an apologist to the public for his unfulfilled promises, but chiefly a specious and transparent attempt to mislead popular judgment against well-established facts and the principles of sound policy which the experience of the most enlightened people have sanctioned as correct. These principles guided Sir Leonard when he belonged to and led the Liberal party in New Brunswick. They were the great lever by which he assisted in removing the objections of the Province to Confederation, and were he promoted to the highest position in the gift of the Tory Party, or capable of making a speech equal to that of Sir Richard Cartwright, himself, his political apostacy would overshadow all, and his insincerity be as fully realised as it has been from the moment he deserted his principles and became at once, a Tory and a Protectionist.

The speech of Sir Richard Cartwright has, no doubt, been carefully read. The contrast it presented to that of Sir Leonard is one of which Liberals may well be proud. It was the answer of a statesman to the platitudes of the mere tricky politician—the warning of one who desired to adhere to a policy based on past experience and promising to promote the general good in the present and future alike, against the reckless and devil-may-care management of Sir John A. Macdonald and his followers.

Sir Charles Tupper's speech, which we publish this week in a condensed form, will give our readers an idea of the kind of defence that gentleman is able to make against the dignified criticism of Sir Richard Cartwright. The Toronto *Globe* very aptly says of Sir Charles' answer to Sir Richard's speech:—

"The speech was unanswerable, and it was not answered. Assault on its maker was the only resource of his opponents, and who is so willing as Sir Charles Tupper to pour out a stream of premeditated abuse? It was the occasion for the

"Sworn scholiast of the bestial parts
Of speech; a ribald mouth to shout
In Folly's horny tympanum
Such things as make the wise man dumb."

Sir Charles made no attempt to defend the Government except when he took a side blow at Sir Leonard Tilley, by the assertion that the Finance Minister did well to sit at the feet of that irresponsible Gamaliel, Sir Alexander Galt. His speech was one long "Yah," a favourite argument of angry Conservatives. He had the audacity to declare that the late Government were responsible for the enormous increase in the expenditure of 1873-74, stating boldly that the canals and railways, to the construction of which the Conservatives had committed the Dominion, were initiated by their opponents. The country will inquire how it is that the only defence of the Government offered by its chosen orator was that an Administration which went out of power eighteen months ago had held office during hard times. What the people want to know is this:—How does it come that the tariff which was to produce at once prosperity and revenue has produced poverty and deficits? Even if proof were given that hard times existed during Mr. Mackenzie's *regime*, and because of that *regime*, it could not exculpate the present Government. Their predecessors did not profess to have a remedy for the depression, they did not tax the country with the intention of making the people rich. The men who got liberty to put on taxation in order to produce prosperity, who have made the uncured patient pay the price which was to restore him to health, are in quite a different position from those who held out no promise of an impossible remedy nor exected payment for one.

It is a relief to turn from such an effort as that of Sir Charles, to the calm, dignified and statesmanlike speech of ex-Premier Mackenzie, which we also present to our readers, in this issue. Canada is, indeed, fortunate in having such men as Mackenzie and Cartwright in the House of Commons to keep before the people, in the midst of the reckless rule of a worse than reckless Administration, the great facts and principles of which, they are the leading exponents. Mr. Mackenzie's speech is the deliberate utterance of a public man who realises the moral as well as political responsibility of the exalted position he occupies—of one who has shown an indifference to the personal enjoyment of office and its advantages, when they could only be retained by the adoption of a policy which he believed would not benefit the people, while it was also wrong in principle, and, in this connection, we may well contrast Mr. Mackenzie's line of conduct with that of the ex-Liberal, Sir Leonard, who has abandoned both his party and principles in order that he might return to the position he was forced to abandon with shame in 1873. The rebuke called out upon Sir John and his followers, by Sir Charles Tupper's indiscreet allusion to the circumstance under which his party sneaked out of office in 1873, is not the least interesting part of Mr. Mackenzie's speech. It emphasises the adage that it is best to "let sleeping dogs lie."

We shall follow this debate and give such portions of it as are most interesting to the people of this section of the country. Our space is, of course limited, but our superior facilities enable us to publish more reading matter than any other country weekly and we cannot, at the present time, make better use of it than in devoting a good deal of it to the utterances of our leading public men. When our readers know what these gentlemen have to say for themselves, they can form the more correct judgment of their