

lish ladies and, instead of using imported goods, wear a coat made of good Canadian material. His waistcoat I believe is formed out of the same material. I cannot say, at this distance, what kind of goods it is with which his limbs are enshrouded, but I am very much inclined to believe that they are not Canadian tweed; and when the hon. gentleman attacked the Liberal party for its want of patriotism, he did so in pants made of foreign cloth. If not, let him speak.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not ask my tailors.

Mr. PATERSON. There sits the hon. Finance Minister, who denounces us for want of patriotism because we object to undue taxation on Irish linen instead of Canadian cotton. He might reply that cotton is hardly a proper article of which to make a shirt for a Finance Minister of Canada. I agree with him that linen, perhaps, looks better; but for the patriot he is, and for the men who denounce us for want of patriotism, he should come forward and be prepared to wear good Canadian cotton. What is true of him is true of the hon. member for Niagara, who poses here as a patriot; but we will not spend the time with him. On all occasions he takes care to tell us how thoroughly loyal he is. It cannot be expected of him, that he should be found refusing to wear English-made goods, but let the gentlemen opposite give evidence of their patriotism, and besides raising their voices in favor of our manufacturers, let them set an example and were these Canadian goods themselves. Then we may expect to have our manufacturers prosper without even the imposition of those duties which are repugnant to the great part of our people. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he burns in his grates any Nova Scotia coal.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do sometimes, not always.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know if I am correctly informed, but I ask the hon. gentleman if it is true that in asking for tenders for the supplies of coal for the Parliament Buildings, it was expressly stated that the coal should be American coal, and that the same thing was done with regard to Rideau Hall?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Only a small quantity of it and for a specific purpose.

Mr. PATERSON. Why should you put in any of it; when you took the duty out of the Yankee, why did you not take it all? The hon. gentlemen divided their patriotism, they wanted a certain amount of money out of the Yankee, and yet they wanted to encourage the Nova Scotia miners; and while I am on that point I might just as well ask another question, and I ask it in all fairness. If the coal duty is paid by the American producers, I ask the hon. Finance Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Railways, why he remitted the duty on material that the Syndicate used in constructing the bridges on their road? The hon. Minister of Finance was a party to making a clause in that Syndicate bargain by which they gave them all the iron for their bridges and all their bridge material, their fish-plates, spikes, and all their telegraphic apparatus, I believe, used in the original construction of the road, duty free; and why, according to the showing of the hon. gentlemen opposite, did they do it to leave an amount of money in the pockets of foreigners which ought to have been taken from them and put into the Treasury of this country. In doing that they gave up the whole question; they admitted by that action that the statements which they make on the floor of this House are without foundation; that the producer pays the duty on goods that come into this country. The hon. gentleman can take, as they say sometimes, either horn of the dilemma—either the foreigner does not pay the duty or they have made a present to the Yankees of the

amount of revenue we should have derived. The hon. gentlemen know how it was; it was a present to the Syndicate; and then they passed an Order in Council by which the manufacturers of iron producing a like material in Canada for supplying any of that article to the Syndicate, is to have an actual bounty given to him out of the taxes of this country. We are quite willing to appeal to the country and make the issue between the Tariff that we advocate and that of the hon. gentlemen opposite; we will be able to show the manufacturers that under the Tariff which we would impose the people will derive as much advantage as they do now, they will get all the legitimate protection they can demand. We will show the artisan and the laboring classes and the agriculturists that they will be placed in no worse position than they have been, but rather in a much better one. We are ready for the fight which the Minister of Finance says will come soon, but there will be other issues than the National Policy before the people then, of which they must take cognizance. There will be the bargain made with the Pacific Railway by hon. gentlemen, and on that the people's judgment must be asked. When that bargain is placed before the country in all its iniquity, hon. gentlemen will find that they cannot force its acceptance upon the people as they did upon this House. The First Minister said in this House that he could sell all our public lands in ten years for \$69,000,000 which he would have in the Treasury, either in cash or in securities as good as cash; and the Minister of Railways gave this House an estimate of the cost of that portion of the work that the Syndicate were to construct; on it he pledged his word, and the statement of his Chief Engineer, that this portion should not cost more than \$48,500,000. They will have to explain to the people of this country how they abandoned that plan without the sanction of Parliament, and gave to that Syndicate, according to their own showing, for \$48,500,000 worth of work, 25,000,000 acres of land (worth at their own calculation \$3 per acre), and \$25,000,000 in cash, making in all \$100,000,000. They will have to tell the people of this country why it was they did not sell those lands and realize the \$69,000,000, and out of that take \$48,500,000 and complete that road and own it themselves, and have \$20,500,000 of cash left in the Treasury; these are points on which the people will have to be answered. They will also have to show why they have locked up that great North-West for the next twenty years in a gigantic monopoly, and they will have to justify the bargain they have made with the Syndicate. They have locked up deliberately that great North West, that empire that is to be, and in addition to \$50,000,000 over and above all they have to expend, they have a monopoly to the right of all freights and of all passengers who may come in and out of that country for 20 years to come. The hon. Minister of Finance knows, and it is a matter of record, that amendment after amendment was moved when there could be no reply made to them, they were so reasonable in themselves, but by their brute force they bore us down in this House, and the people of the country knew it and hon. gentlemen opposite will feel that at the next election. We know the result with reference to that matter—that hon. gentlemen opposite have exercised the power of disallowance of a charter passed by the Manitoba Legislature, and have evinced a determination to keep the lands locked up in that country. They will have to answer, with reference to the Pacific Railway Company, the increased charges imposed. One of their planks before the people was a diminution in the public expenditure. But what are the facts? Why it has gone up, as their Estimates ask \$3,000,000 more than was required by the late Administration. On those points they will have to answer to the country, as well as for all their acts of maladministration since they assumed office.

Mr. PLUMB. What is the "diminution?"