

present duty, it would have been inconsistent for me, in the same breath, to say that the Government would give the most serious consideration to this question. The hon. gentleman wishes to put me in the position of having made a false statement. The policy of this Government is a Protective policy. We have said we are determined to make it a success. We must, in order to meet the prejudices, to a certain extent, at any rate, of pre-formed opinions, introduce it with the small edge of the wedge first; and as we are able to show the people that by the imposition of additional duties, by the competition that will grow, as the result of that, they obtain the articles they consume as cheap as before, the people then will say: "Go on extending and widening that policy." We might have said to the people of the country: "We have carried the policy in the Tariff as it stands;" but we do not say that, we say that the country has endorsed this policy; we do not say they have endorsed the policy just as it is—though we might have said so—but that the country has declared it is right, and in the general interest, to give Protection to the industries of the country. And if our present Protection is not found sufficient, we have said, and I say it here, it will be the policy of the Government, where it does not lead to sufficient competition, to give the people an article at a low price, to give more Protection, because we will have this market for our people if we can. In this case it is likely. \$2 a ton costs the country something, but they all contribute to it, it will be taken out of the general Treasury. But if we can put thousands of men to work in mining our ores, in the development of our coal, and in converting it into coke and the smelting of this iron, we create a large industry in the country, we give employment to the people, who will eventually get their steak as cheaply as before. That is the policy of the Government, and this is the outcome of that proposition. I have pointed out clearly to the House that it would have been inconsistent—and I never could have said what I have been charged with—I assured the forty members of this House, who put the question to us, that we would give the subject our most careful consideration, and see what additional Protection we would give.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman complains of having words put in his mouth. Now, I observed carefully the words used by the hon. member for West Durham, and they were "to maintain the policy," I am positive these were the words.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The last term he used was "to maintain the position." But the hon. member went further; he drove it home, and he said I had stated that we would extend it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In no Ministerial manifesto that I saw, nor in the words put into the mouth of the Governor General, nor in the Ministerial address to the electors, have I seen it announced that it was the intention of the Government to increase this rate of taxation. No indication has been given that the present rate would not be sufficient, and the hon. gentleman and his colleagues in that respect carried the country by false pretences.

Mr. BLAKE. When the hon. gentleman spoke about millions which were about to be invested, as he had received assurances on certain conditions, he did not say what industry those millions were to be invested in. He said he had application from capitalists involving the investment of millions if the Government was consistent in this policy—I cannot give the exact words—but it was a policy of maintenance. That is plain, because the first question I asked the hon. gentleman was this: when the hon. gentleman made a statement about millions was he referring amongst other things to iron? I did not know that he was referring to iron; he did not tell the House to what he was referring on that occasion, and I had to ask him.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I made a special statement about iron.

Mr. BLAKE. In answer to the late hon. member for King's, when he read the memorial of the forty members, he made a statement that was indefinite. That is the habit of the Government. If we ask whether a bridge is to be built at Oromocto? it is under consideration whether; a law is to be produced? that question is not yet decided. The hon. gentleman made an answer of that kind on that occasion. He declaimed about millions, but he did not refer to iron in terms, or to any other particular industry; he, therefore, did not connect that investment in his statement to the House and public with iron. I was obliged to ask him, was he referring to iron? He says, to-day, that he was referring to iron, at any rate, amongst others. And his reply to me was, that if I was referring to iron alone, he did not say so; but what he did say was, that promises or representations were made as to an investment of millions, dependent—I will not be tied down to a word, for I do not remember the exact words—but dependent, not upon an increased Tariff, but the maintenance of the policy of the Government as it was then in operation, and upon which they went to the people. But now we understand the whole thing. The hon. gentleman, in denying the accusation of want of candor, has himself condemned himself in that regard. What does he say? He says: "We have to go on by degrees, we have to introduce the thin end of the wedge." They get the thin end of the wedge in—the hon. Minister of Railways knows all about the thin end of the wedge—they have got the thin end of the wedge in, and he says now we will drive it home.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that while we have been driving it home in one direction, we have been withdrawing it in another. We have been taking it off tea, coffee, tobacco, tin, and a variety of other articles; we took off the stamp tax; and we have been able to do it because we have been driving it home in other directions. I thought I was going to make the case the strongest possible by confining it to iron, and hon. members who were in the House last Session will recollect that I made that statement. I made it last year, when this capitalist came to me and represented to me that he was concerned about the permanency of this Tariff; he was afraid it would not be permanent. He mentioned the hostility of the *Globe*, which was the paper most read in the United States, and its prediction that if a new Government came into power the Tariff would be changed. I repeated this conversation in the House, and I am confident the substance will be found recorded in the *Hansard*. Therefore, I say that our present proposition is perfectly consistent, for we have never declared or intimated that we would not go a step beyond the present rates whenever the public interest seemed to require it. Those forty members know that the Government gave them encouragement to expect it, and that was not a hole-and-corner matter. The hon. member knew that statement was made here, and when he asked me if it was not the case, I said that the most careful consideration would be given to the subject.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. member for West Durham has endeavored in several speeches he has made to this Committee with a great many words, and I must say with words that seem to me to contain a great deal of sophistry, to convict the hon. Finance Minister of want of candor, of inconsistency, in some statement he has made in the House upon the question of the introduction of foreign capital into Canada. I have listened attentively to what the hon. gentleman opposite has said, but I have failed even to follow his line of argument, no doubt owing to my own obtuseness, or perhaps to the very great number of words in which he wrapped up his argument, and at all events I have failed