

was no wide difference between the parties. There was, however, a very considerable number of hon. members who had honest convictions on this matter altogether outside of the question of tariff, who were anxious to adopt a system of legislation which would aid in promoting the interests of the country, laying down and affirming the principle, as far as it was possible to affirm it, that we should attend to our own people and industries, that we should endeavour to prevent this country from being kept in a chronic state of crisis by being troubled with the fluctuating condition of the markets of the world; that we should seek to keep the people within our own territory by manufacturing everything we could manufacture in this country for our own people, so that the producer and consumer might be placed side by side, so that everything required by our own people might be produced by them, whereby we would save the enormous cost of carrying our raw material to foreign markets and the freight of its return as manufactured goods. There was one extreme of free trade, the middle course of a revenue tariff, and the third course, that of protection which was outside of the tariff altogether, which must be taken into account when they considered the industries of the country and not the revenue, although the one might be somewhat connected with the other. They heard an everlasting shout about incidental protection. It was an incidental fraud, for there was no such thing; what was so called simply arose from the fact that the country had to raise a revenue under the tariff, and some branch of industry received an advantage from it. The tariff was not to be credited with that—it was a mere accident. What he and many others desired was that the country should go outside of the revenue and come fairly to the Protectionist view. Under these circumstances he felt it to be his duty to vote against both amendments, and he hoped every hon. member supporting the Government would not view the subject in any other way. If the question had arisen upon a wide Protectionist issue, he would have to consider, as would every other hon. member, whether, under ordinary cir-

cumstances, it would be their duty to vote in favour of it from principle, or whether they would fall back on the other consideration, whether it would be desirable that the present occupants of the Treasury benches should be defeated and driven from office. That, indeed, was involved in the present discussion. That amounting to a vote of want of confidence in the Government, the House had to consider the character of the members of the Administration and of the leaders of the Conservative party, and its constitution. That, however, was a very small part of the issues involved, and he was not prepared to say that, upon the miserable amendment of the right hon. member for Kingston, he would disorganise the whole business of the country, and drive the present Government from power. It was an insult to the common sense of hon. members that the right hon. gentleman should place before them such an amendment, which it had taken a year to mature, and ask them to change the Administration by adopting it. He would take very good care not to be caught by such chaff. If the amendment had been so drawn as to raise the general question of protection, it would have been a grave issue, but, as it had been submitted, there was no gravity about it, and it was a very small matter. No doubt the Government would find that a feeling was arising among the people that outside of the tariff question they would have to deal with the wide principle of protection. While that question was not before them for consideration at present, he would express the desire that the financial affairs of the Dominion should be settled upon a wide principle of protection that would enable the country to husband its resources. He had thus explained the course he intended to follow and the reason therefor. There was no inconsistency between his present course and that he had always advocated; but while he was as strong an admirer of the principle of protection as ever, he would not vote in favour of either of the amendments before the House.

Mr. BERTRAM said he proposed to notice some of the points dwelt upon by the hon. member for West York, who had spoken of the general prin-