

**Inadequate Reform of the Tariff--The N. P. Maimed But Not
Rendered Innocuous--Sir John Macdonald and Protection
---Fosterian Fallacies Exposed.**

Well, with respect to the noble, the lofty, the patriotic motives which actuated the noble men who founded and introduced the N. P. and the tariff based thereon, it is possible for us to obtain a little better evidence than that of the finance minister. That honorable gentleman was not present on that auspicious occasion; he did not enter parliament until many years after the tariff was an accomplished fact. Now we are highly privileged in having in this house, and I am delighted to see him here now, a gentleman who was present on that

Mr. McNeill—I would like to ask the honorable gentleman if there is not incidental protection upon whiskey?

Sir Richard Cartwright—The honorable member had better refer that question to the prohibition commission. My impression is that it is the other way. My impression is that home made whiskey is considerably more taxed than it ought to be in proportion to the taxes which

how these causes are beyond their control. What said the hon. gentleman's friends and predecessors when they were preaching the N. P. in 1878? Why, our ears were dinned with declarations that with the N. P. the people would have a home market for everything they could raise and obtain high prices for everything they could produce. Every village would become a town, every town would

months, as he says, before a general election, may not after the general election be reconsidered and reconstructed as heretofore. But, as he says, the Government must, at least, take good, and strong, and solid material guarantees, that these gentlemen must be kept in the same frame of mind that they were in when they were elected. We asked the hon. gentleman last night for information, which, I think, we had a right to ask, whether he would extend to the Opposition the same consideration to the extent in which these varied changes would affect the revenue of the country. He said, "The answer we got," he said, "was that the answer was no." We wanted to know the reasons for this. It was likely to accrue in consequence of the reductions of duty, but the hon. gentleman said that he did not know. We asked to know the losses which were likely to be sustained by the bounties he proposed to give, but the hon. gentleman did not know. The hon. gentleman said that it was all guess-work, and that the only thing that was certain was that the Government's propositions were in brief this: that he was about to make a leap in the dark and he did

cent, caseron from Great Britain 52 per cent, and from the United States 45 per cent, and so on through a long list of countries in which the goods are sold at the house. Now I should like to know what under these circumstances is the hope of the government. Well, sir, apparently the hope is that the goods will simply in the chapter of accidents. It is possible, and I think in their inmost hearts they will be heartily glad of it, that tariff wars will be avoided. But I think it is possible that the well expressed will of the people of the United States may be frustrated.

Now I should like to observe that the gentleman did in one or two places deprecate allusions to the past. We dwell with the present and dwell with the present, he said. With the present we can understand perfectly why the non- gentleman and some of his friends too, should deprecate allusions to the past. People who dwell with the present should not like allusions to the past. If I wished to engear myself to an assemblage

Why, after I took back to the year 1873 and what do I find? I find that we had then a total volume of trade of \$217,000,000. The hon. gentleman asks me what that means. I tell him, sir, that it means that in 1873, twenty years ago, with a population of three and three-quarter-millions all told, we had a per capita trade of \$75 per head, and to-day with a population of five millions we have a total trade of not more than \$200,000,000. That means that we have a per capita trade of only \$40, relatively of the standard we had obtained in 1873. Well, sir, I am glad to see that we are not doing so well, but, on my word, I am not doing so well. In the 20 years of about thirty-three millions of dollars string an average total trade of \$50, less than we were had attained in 1873, should quite enough to show all the other facts that I have alluded to.

I think that before the hon. gentleman comes to the house to conduct a discussion upon his subject, he ought to have stated fairly and candidly to his own colleagues

that, whom it is con-
 about election time
 wally escaped, but the
 to be slaughtered to
 The Non gentlemen,
 ed, and thoroughly con-
 they have been quite
 half a dozen little cir-
 been convicted of nefar-
 the Non gentlemen
 careful to draw the
 knew too much. Sin-
 born of virtue which
 the minister of justice
 minister of business
 justice was perfectly
 John Charles Rykert o-
 ed election. The mi-
 ly willing to sacrifice
 league whose presence
 in his way, but
 man is a very care-
 up any protected ind-
 milked to some purp-