

in the right direction of the policy the Opposition had been urging. He would vote for it because it was a part of that policy which was being brought up piecemeal by the supporters of the Government. Suppose they should carry a duty on coal, then when Protection to manufacturers was proposed, the representatives of the coal interest would be compelled to vote for it, because if they did not the Protection they had would be repealed. The political reason was, that the Premier had declared all the votes on motions of this kind to be votes of want of confidence. When he (Sir John A. Macdonald) introduced his resolution, he (Mr. Mackenzie) called it a want of confidence motion, and, as a consequence, the Ministerialists were whipped in, the whip sounded through the House, the studs sprang to the collar, and many were converted, including the hon. members for North Norfolk and North Oxford. Notwithstanding that, four, who ordinarily supported the Government, were not converted, and they voted want of confidence—Messrs. Brown, Coupal, Macdonald (Cornwall), and Robillard—and it was only right to say that any one who voted want of confidence had not regained his confidence in the Government until he was converted. So that these gentlemen, in justice to them, it should be said, still had no confidence in the Government. Then there came afterwards a motion for the member for West Hastings and the member for East Durham, who also proposed a vote of want of confidence in the Government because the Premier would not put a duty on wheat. There were six Ministerialists who voted want of confidence in the Government on the resolution proposed by the member for Iberville (Mr. Bechard) to protect coarse grains. The House did not know how many Ministerialists would vote for the present resolution, but it was certain the mover and seconder and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) would. There were three. Altogether there were ten who had voted against the Government. The Government had a majority in the first Session of eighty-six votes. On the question of policy raised under his resolution, they had a majority of thirty-seven, and all remembered what

an active whip had been used to get that majority. Of those thirty-seven there were now ten who reversed their views and were about to declare, at this moment, a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and those ten would count twenty on a division; therefore, the Government had a majority, on this individual vote, of seventeen. So that on the trade of policy, the tariff policy of the Government, the strong majority of eighty-six would stand, after this vote, only seventeen. That was a triumph for the Opposition, and foreshadowed the result at the approaching elections. Why did these gentlemen, who ordinarily supported the Premier, now vote against his policy? Because the pressure of their constituents demanded this vote from them. Anxious as they were to support him, they felt constrained to vote either for his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) motion, or for the motion on wheat and flour, or the motion on coarse grains, or the motion on coal.

MR. JONES (South Leeds) said the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) had stated that Mr. Fraser, the Secretary of the Manufacturers' Association, who was a Reformer, was a body-servant of the right hon. member for Kingston, and that the meeting of that Association, held in Toronto, had been called together by Mr. Fraser going around to different towns and nominating gentlemen to attend it. Both of those statements were totally unfounded and incorrect. With regard to the meeting itself, the hon. gentleman said it consisted of a miserable few of fifty. That meeting was attended by delegates who had been elected by the different Associations throughout Canada, from Montreal to Sarnia, and who represented every shade of politics; and the resolutions were passed unanimously. He, as an Ontario manufacturer, was ready to place the duty on coal which a readjustment of the tariff would require, but could not give his support to this specific motion for a duty of 75c. per ton.

MR. KERR said, as a representative of Ontario, he entered his solemn protest against this resolution. He did