

# House of Commons Debates.

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 10th July, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege, for the purpose of correcting a misstatement in a report contained in a very respectable journal indeed, the *Toronto Mail*, and I have no doubt the misreport was in consequence of an accident or misapprehension. The report is as follows:—

“Mr. BOWELL. That statement is made for a purpose. May I tell the hon. gentleman it is just as false—

“Mr. CHARLTON. As false as hell? (Laughter).”

I did not use that language, and I do not wish to take from the Minister of Customs the laurels that belong to him in that regard.

### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: “That the Resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on Tuesday last, the 23rd instant, be read a second time:” and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House on a subject which has engaged its attention for the last few days, I must claim the indulgence of members on both sides. There has been an exhaustive debate on questions of particular interest to this country, on questions on which hon. members on both sides of the House do not see eye to eye. Probably we have been brought up in different atmospheres and under different political circumstances, and while the members of each party are endeavouring to do what they believe to be right and in the interest of the country we cannot agree, it is therefore important that a full, complete and ample discussion should take

place on all these important questions. We have heard during the last few days many eloquent speeches from the other side of the House lauding the financial policy of the Government, and particularly lauding the fiscal policy of the Government. We on this side of the House are opposed both to the financial and fiscal policy of the Government, believing they are both contrary to the best interests of this country. We believe that the financial administration of public affairs by the Government now in power, has not been in the interests of the country. We were told yesterday by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) that the policy of the Government deserved the endorsement of every individual in the country, that, when compared with the financial policy of the Liberal Government, under the able leadership of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), the Conservatives had a right to be proud of their policy. The hon. gentleman proceeded to show that during the Liberal Administration there was a succession of deficits, and he quoted from the Public Accounts to show that, during four years out of the five years the Liberals were in power, there was no less than \$6,500,000 of deficit incurred. In connection with that statement he said that during that time the taxation of the people did not decrease. If the hon. gentleman will turn up the Public Accounts, on page 30, Roman numerals, he will find he was mistaken in that statement, and I am astonished that he did not notice that the taxation of the people during those four years of deficit did decrease. The hon. gentleman has said that we had \$6,500,000 of deficits during the years 1874-75, 1875-76, 1876-77, 1877-78, and 1878-79, while the taxation remained fully as high as before. The taxation during the first year of the Liberal Administration was \$20,644,878, and the average taxation of the other four years during which there were deficits was only \$18,159,000, or more than \$2,500,000 less than during the first year of the Administration of the Liberal party. But the hon. member did not tell the House that there were deficits during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. He