

only abstracted from it enormous sums by a raking and grinding Tariff, which is oppressive in its character and vexatious in its operation. But this is not all, Sir, or nearly all. We have been considering hitherto only the amounts that come into the hon. Minister's hands. But the uncounted millions which go into the pockets of the thousands of private tax-gatherers created by this Tariff, partly to unduly swell the legitimate profits of some industries, and the rest to compensate for the misdirected and unprofitable application of capital and labour to other trades; these millions though they are paid by the mass of the consumers, as surely as if they went into the Minister's hands, we are unable to ascertain or take into account. But this we know, that their receipt does not swell the Public Treasure. The people pay them, but the private, not the public tax-gatherer receives them; and so, though the people pay, they receive nothing in return. Sir, we have reached and passed, designedly passed, in many cases, the effective limits of a Revenue Tariff. We have been aiming at different and inconsistent ends. Pursuing revenue through imports, we have been attempting at the same time to check imports, on which our revenue depends, and to substitute for them home manufactures. And certain it is, that unless the hon. gentleman has wholly miscalculated his action, unless he has wholly bungled in the use of the great weapon he has been wielding, he will have stimulated home manufactures in respect of some of the articles of importation most productive of revenue. It is certain that he will have deprived the coffers of the country of the duties to be derived from those articles.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: As in the United States for instance.

MR. BLAKE: I do not propose, as I have already said, just now to enter into a general discussion of Free-trade and Protection, or to analyse the condition of the United States, or to examine how far they may be able to endure losses and to play tricks with the principles of political economy, which we can by no means afford. I think the distinctions are obvious. Nor do I intend to hazard a conjecture as to which of the two inconsistent objects which the hon. gentleman

has been pursuing he will earliest or most signally succeed in. I say that an effect will be sooner or later produced; and while in case of good crops and high prices there is no doubt the last Customs revenue will next year be increased; there is no doubt, also, that a very large sum will be sooner or later—and I think tolerably soon—diverted from the Custom-house to the pockets of individuals. It is plain, by the admission of the hon. gentleman to the extent of \$4,000,000, and, by the figures I have stated to a much larger amount, that we have greatly increased the burden of our taxation, and that every dollar that we are paying and are to pay for interest on the construction of the Pacific Railway, has come and must come out of this increased taxation, or from further additions to our burdens. It is obvious that you cannot meet in any other way the additional interest for the construction of the Railway; and, therefore, your plan is a deliberate violation of the settled and established policy of Parliament. To our present load we are to add many millions more for that work, and where, save from these odious and oppressive added taxes under which we labour, can you find the interest? Even apart from the Pacific Railway, and further expenditure on it, we are in a critical condition. We are trying one great experiment in trade. We are engaged in a supreme effort to make both ends meet in finance. We have not yet accomplished that feat. The hon. gentleman said a month or six weeks ago that the Revenue for this year would be within half a million of the expenditure. I wonder whether he will say so when he moves the second reading of the Supply Bill? We on this side believe the deficiency will be a great deal more. We are not yet in a state of equilibrium as to receipts and expenditure. We are engaged, I say, in one great experiment. Is one great experiment not enough at a time? Would it not be better not to plunge too deeply into experiments, speculations and conjectures? Would it not be better, as we are engaged in this large financial, commercial and fiscal venture, not to enter into fresh pecuniary engagements of an enormous character, based upon expectations of the vaguest and most fantastic kind? Are we now

MR. BLAKE.