

try to railway stations for their supplies, at an additional cost of freight, and delay of time. With respect to cornmeal, there was no pretence that Ontario could supply them for years. New Brunswick, last year, consumed 60,000 barrels, on which quantity she would have, in future, to pay a duty of 40c. per barrel. Nobody could argue that a duty of 15c. per bushel on barley would be of the slightest value to the farmers of Ontario, as very little barley was imported. On the contrary, we exported several millions more than we imported. Pork could be protected, but it was not, because protection on it would make the burdens of the lumberman absolutely intolerable. Wool was not protected. That the imposition of a duty on coarse woollen goods would lead to the use of our wool, farmers would be slow to believe. They now sold their wool to the United States, getting for it there double the price at which the short staple wool used in Canadian manufactures could be purchased. The Finance Minister had been extolled over and over again as an old Free-trader who had been converted by the exigencies of the moment to the principles of Protection. Those who spoke so did not know his history. He began public life as a Protectionist of the deepest dye. The first he (Mr. Anglin) heard of him was at a meeting, held in Carleton, St. John, at which he earnestly advocated Protection. They had tried Protection in New Brunswick, and went so far as to impose a duty on hides, which, under this tariff, were not protected. All the Protection offered to the farmer by this tariff was merely nominal, merely a myth, and, unless the farmer was more stupid than he (Mr. Anglin) believed him to be, as stolid indeed as hon. gentlemen opposite must think he was, he would find out that in this wonderful tariff there was no Protection for him. Everything he used, his spade, his shovel, his scythe, his threshing-machine, his ploughs, the clothes he wore, every article of goods he purchased, was taxed from 20 to 60 per cent., to add to the revenue of the poor, distressed manufacturers, who were starving on half a million dollars apiece. Next to the farming, came the lumbering industry. The hon. member for North Ren-

frew undertook to prove that this was a declining industry, by showing a falling-off in the export return of lumber to the United States, and the hon. the Finance Minister was reported to have so spoken of it; but it was still, and it would for many years continue to be, one of the great industries of Canada, and, when times improved in the United States, as he hoped they soon would, and the people of that country could afford to use more of our lumber, and afford to pay a better price for it, that great industry, now so depressed, would revive. What did this tariff do for the lumber trade? It did not because it could not, afford it the slightest Protection. Nothing that this Parliament could do would increase the price of lumber in the foreign market a single cent, but it did impose grievous burdens on that industry. The hon. member for Queen's, N.B., who was well acquainted with the business, calculated that the burdens so imposed were equal to 60c. per thousand superficial feet, and that in New Brunswick alone it would amount to \$300,000. This enormous sum could not be taken out of the profits of the trade, which were already exceedingly small, and it must come out of the pockets of the unfortunate workmen employed in the woods, in the streams, in the mills, and in loading the vessels in the ports, although their wages were now lower than they had been for many many years. What did the fishermen get under this tariff? They were a most deserving and industrious class, and added a great deal to the wealth of the country. But they found that they had received no consideration whatever. On every article they used they would have to pay greatly increased duties, except their canvas and lines and twines, on which, thanks to the exertions of some hon. gentlemen who represented fishermen, the increase at one time proposed would not be imposed, and molasses, the duty on which was to be reduced some 2c. a gallon. What had been done for the ship-owners, and those engaged in the important shipping industry of the country? There was to be a drawback on articles used in ship-building, but an hon. gentleman who tried to find out what the drawback meant, was met by the vague promise that some arrangement would be made