

you this day week on the question now before the House, I moved an amendment to the resolution then in your hands. That amendment I discovered afterwards was ruled out of order, and very properly so, I believe, according to the practice of the House; but I was not aware when I proposed it that such was the case. I told you then I would take the very earliest opportunity of submitting that resolution again to this House, and getting a clear and distinct vote upon it. With that view I have now risen, and I wish to state that since I offered my amendment on the first occasion I have had the satisfaction of visiting some of my constituents in Montreal, and they have requested that I should bring this measure squarely and fairly before the House and get a distinct and plain vote upon it. In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the nature of the resolution, I will now read it—That all the words after “that” in the original motion be struck out and the following inserted instead thereof: “This House deeply regrets that the Government has not proposed to Parliament a policy of increased protection to our various and important manufactures, the large amount of capital now invested therein, and the present depressed condition of the country rendering such a policy necessary to restore them to a condition of prosperity.” I do not intend to detain the House on this question, because it has already been very fully discussed; but, as I have stated, I wish to get a vote on this resolution. To my mind it is very plain and straightforward, and admits of no trimming and no dissimulation. When I had the honour of addressing my constituents previous to the election, I stated distinctly the line I intended to adopt. The amendment is in accordance with the policy I then foreshadowed, and it is with that view I now bring it forward.

The gentlemen who have addressed you on this subject, and especially those entertaining what they are pleased to term free-trade proclivities, have spoken very fully as to their adherence to that policy. I maintain that free-trade is a perfect absurdity, and that we have no such thing in this Dominion. A very large portion of

the revenue has to be raised by the imposition of duties upon imports; therefore, to say that this is a free-trade country, or that we can pursue a free-trade policy, is, to my mind at least, a perfect absurdity. Those gentlemen have dwelt very much on that theme, and have talked with a great deal of force as to the injustice of placing taxes upon the farming and lumber interests to their injury, merely for the benefit of a few manufacturers. I stated last Tuesday, and I repeat it now, that the result of discriminating duties on our manufacturing industries, instead of increasing the prices of articles required by the farmers and lumbermen, have in almost every instance decreased the price to the consumer. I am prepared to prove that, and in support of the statement I then made, I may say that three gentlemen were brought before the Committee on Commercial Depression—

Mr. SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman is not at liberty to speak of what took place before the Committee.

Mr. WORKMAN—I stand corrected, then. I may state that I had a conversation with three gentlemen who are thoroughly competent to give an opinion on the subject; and if you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I shall mention their names. One was Mr. Perley, of this city, a very large lumber merchant, carrying on an extensive business; another was Mr. Baldwin, and the other Mr. Booth. I put this question to these gentlemen:—Has the increase of the duties on the articles you consume in your shanties, mills, &c., increased the price of these materials to you within the last few years? Their answer was plain and distinct, that it had not, but on the contrary, their plant (such as saws, augurs, spades, shovels and everything almost that is used in their establishments) are manufactured in Canada, and are really cheaper to-day than they were a few years ago. That is a sufficient answer to those gentlemen who claim that any increase of duty would increase the tax upon lumbermen and farmers.

I am prepared to prove the same thing with reference to the farming interest; the implements used by the