

languishing industries, so have gentlemen on the Treasury Benches. I have taken down for example the words of the Finance Minister on the subject, and before recording my vote I wish to ask him what he means by the following:—"I do not wish to lose sight of the fair play due to our manufactures." I wish to ask the Minister of Finance if by these words he understands that if new dangers should arise to our industries, no remedies are to be provided for those dangers? I wish to ask if, in the ever-changing phases of trade, manufactures languish, there are no remedies to be found. I wish to know if there is such an undue desire to provide for the nineteen-twentieths there is no determination shown to make provision for the other twentieth. The Minister of Finance said that he was not prepared to legislate for one-twentieth part of the population to the exclusion of nineteen-twentieths; but I ask whether if the latter have rights, the former do not also possess them? If the hon. gentleman would pause for a moment, he would have thought that the class which has invested eighty millions in plant and in the development of the industries of this country, annually expending forty millions of dollars and employing two hundred thousand persons were entitled to consideration. If three pensions are allowed to each of the 200,000, which would be a fair allowance for each family, it would give a total of 600,000, equal to more than one-eighth of our population; and if you add those who are dependant for support upon other industries, you have as many more, or fully one-fourth of our entire population interested in manufactures. He will agree with me that this is something more than one-twentieth. I will simply ask in conclusion, whether the Finance Minister will announce to this House--because I hold that a hasty adjustment of the tariff would be a dangerous experiment--whether after he has patiently investigated and looked into the claims of these languishing industries, he will provide such measures as will save them from destruction. It is due to me that this question should be answered before I record my vote.

Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT—I do not propose at this hour to enter on my reply to the right hon. member for Kingston, or to make any reference to matters that have arisen in this debate, I merely rise to answer the question of the hon. member for Centre Toronto. Undoubtedly circumstances may arise—we have never denied that they might arise—which will require further action at our hands. Our position is simply that we see no occasion at present for taking further action.

The members were then called in, and a division was taken with the following result :

YEAS :

Messieurs.

Baby,	Lanther,
Benoit,	Little,
Blain,	Macdonald (Cornwall),
Blanchet,	Macdonald (Kingston),
Bowell,	Macdonald (Toronto),
Brooks,	McDonald (C. Breton),
Brouse,	McDougall (Three Riv),
Brown,	Macmillan,
Cameron, (Victoria.)	McCallum,
Caron,	McQuade,
Cimon,	Masson,
Colby,	Mitchell,
Cuthbert,	Monteith,
DeCosmos,	Montplaisir,
Desjardins,	Mousseau,
Devlin,	Palmer,
Domville,	Pinsonneault,
Dugas,	Platt,
Farrow,	Plumb,
Ferguson,	Pope,
Flesher,	Robinson,
Fraser,	Robitaille,
Gaudet,	Rouleau,
Gill,	Stephenson,
Haggart,	Tupper,
Harwood,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Hurteau,	White (Hastings),
Irving,	White (Renfrew),
Jetté,	Wood,
Jones (Leeds),	Workman,
Kirkpatrick,	Wright (Ottawa,)
Langevin,	Wright (Pontiac,)—64.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Appleby,	Huntington,
Archibald,	Jones (Halifax),
Aylmer,	Kerr,
Bain,	Killam,
Bannatyne,	Kirk,
Barthe,	Lafamme,
Béchar,	Laird,
Bernier,	Lajoie,
Bertram,	Landerkin,
Biggar,	Langlois,
Blake,	Laurier,
Borden,	MacDonnell (Inverness),
Borron,	MacDougall (Elgin),
Bourassa,	McKay (Cape Breton),
Bowman,	Mackenzie,
Boyer,	McCraney,