

him while Minister of Finance, for the purpose of pressing upon him and the Government the expediency of imposing the very duties which members on that side of the House declaimed against so vehemently, and which he was said to have advocated during his perambulations in the West.

Now he did not during the whole course of his career say anything which would justify the statements made by the hon. gentleman. He never was a protectionist, and never pretended to be a protectionist. He had in the course of his life studied political economy, as laid down by several most eminent writers upon the subject, with whose opinions he agreed. He had ever been perfectly consistent so far as that was concerned, and he would have called upon the Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) had that gentleman been in his place to attest that there was nothing said in their western tour which could be construed as protection pure and simple.

What they did say was that if the people desired protection, or incidental protection, it was not for the Government to say they should not have it. He would challenge his hon. friend to lay his finger upon a single statement made by him or the Minister of Justice, in which they had expressed themselves in favour of putting taxes upon the people merely for the purpose of carrying out the principle of protection. He was not going to review the whole of the speech of the hon. gentleman, which he understood, was made for the purpose of eliciting the opinions held by the members of the Government upon that subject. His hon. friend the Minister of Finance pointed out the small taxation imposed upon the people of this country, which was about \$4 per head of the population. The hon. gentleman, in commenting upon this, had compared it with the taxation upon the people of England, and had asserted that there was a very large amount of local taxation, which had to be added to the figures appearing on the statement of his hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

The argument was entirely false, for it was well known that in that respect, England, with her poor rate and other small taxes, would compare very unfavourably with Canada. In this country taxation was stated to be \$4.00 per head per annum. In England it was \$11.50 per head per annum, and upwards of \$7 per head in the United States. In England the taxation necessary to meet the interest upon the National Debt was alone more per head than the whole taxation in the Dominion. He did not understand the budget speech to have meant several things which the hon. gentleman thought it did, and he did not believe that that gentleman put the proper construction on that part of it which related to the export trade of the country.

One of the greatest successes which attended Confederation was the saving which it enabled them to accomplish in the expenditure of the Dominion. He had entire confidence in the state of things which existed at present and had no desire for a change when the necessity for it arose.

Mr. OLIVER defended the conduct of the hon. member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) in referring to the hon. member for

Vancouver (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks). He denied ever having been or having the intention of ever becoming a Protectionist and had only applied to the hon. member for Vancouver as Minister of Finance as one of the deputation from his constituents, who desired reciprocity with the United States. He utterly denied being a protectionist.

He was well pleased with the statement of the Finance Minister as to the financial position of the country, but he would make one remark in reference to a subject which was not referred to, and that was the increase of expenditure. The expenditure had increased since 1868 by 50 per cent, while the revenue had increased only 25 per cent during the same period. He pointed out the difference of the case in the United States. He inquired if deposits from insurance companies and savings banks were included in the statement made by the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY: Yes, they are.

Mr. OLIVER continued to say it was a usual practice of the hon. member for Vancouver to fling something across the floor of the House before he sat down, and endeavoured to justify himself for holding unpopular views by saying some hon. gentlemen did the same.

Mr. YOUNG (Waterloo South) said in the statement of exports and imports the Minister of Finance told the House something they knew from reading the daily newspapers and other public magazines. That the country was prosperous in the whole was an undoubted fact; but this arose not from the economy of the Government, but from the industry and perseverance of the people (*hear, hear*), and that, too, is in spite of the lavish expenditure of the Government. (*Oh, oh, and cheers.*) He commented strongly on the vacillating policy with regard to the tariff. At one time, in the first Parliament, they had told the House it was absolutely necessary that duties should be put upon flour and similar articles. The second session they were told these must be taken off, and in the third they were yet again put on. This time it was said the question was settled for all time. Latterly these duties were taken off by the House not with the concurrence of the Government but in spite of their strenuous efforts. He quite believed that in the heat of debate gentlemen allowed matters of importance to slip from their memory, but he was astonished to find such extraordinary statements made by the late Minister of Finance in the question of protection. He contended that there was no question that that gentleman and the Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) had more largely endeavoured to make political capital out of that this same question during the late election campaign. He referred to the statement made at Goderich by the Minister of Justice, where, as he was reported in the *Mail*, which hon. gentlemen took as a great authority, he had advocated not merely protection to farmers—a gross piece of humbug—but he actually claimed it for sale also. (*Laughter.*) He pointed out that an enormous expenditure over what was actually necessary for the purposes of the Government of the country had taken place. Railways for the present had filled the coffers of the Government, but who was prepared to deny that they had added to the actual debt