

told by the hon. gentlemen on the other side that they would get no increased protection. I claim that both sides were discussing principles that involved, no doubt, individual interests; and I would ask if it was not the highest tribute that could be paid to the people of the Dominion to say that, on the 17th September, they laid aside all party questions, and voted for their principles by an overwhelming majority, sustaining the men who have submitted this policy to Parliament. We are told that this is a sectional policy, that it is going to separate the people, that the Government or the Finance Minister was simply a Committee appointed to receive propositions from the men who came to Ottawa. I can only say that, if we accepted the propositions from all parts of the Dominion, the tariff would have been a queer mixture indeed, because we naturally had conflicting interests to deal with. But the Government, in view of its responsibilities, as representing Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and the North-West, had to consider and decide as to what was in the interest of the whole Dominion, and what might meet fairly and justly, the interest of the whole country. If we had come down with a proposition directly in the interest of one Province, no matter how great it might be, had we taken propositions *en bloc* from Ontario for example, the other Provinces would have grounds for complaint. Our scheme is not for a section, but for the interest of the whole country. A great deal has been said about the poor man by hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, if these propositions are successful, the labouring man will derive the greatest benefit from them. If they are now idle, what is the advantage of their living in a cheap country? Do you want him to be idle? No; you wish to get him something to do. When our friends on the other side of the Atlantic understand our scheme, and see that, instead of sending hundreds of thousands of people out of this country, it is to keep them in it, under the sovereignty and power of England, they will heartily approve of it. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) said that I had stated that, had I been in office in 1874, I would not have disturbed the rate of 15

per cent. I did say so. We intimated, in 1873, that there would probably be a change in the tariff the next Session, which then, however, we did not need. Then we had an ample revenue for our purpose, to meet the \$22,500,000 that ought to have been expended, and no more. I stated that, for the years 1873 to 1878, the expenditures of the government of this country might have been kept within \$22,500,000, or an average for those four years. The Estimates I submitted to Parliament a few days since prove that. I did state this: that, had we been in power, we would not have asked to disturb the 15 per cent. list. We would have taken the money out of other articles that would have afforded encouragement to the industries of the country. And now, if we ask something more than 17½ per cent., it is because we are under the painful necessity of having \$2,000,000 more of money than 17½ per cent. yields, not because it is our desire or our wish to increase taxation. But we come back to the poor man. I stated, for the purpose of showing the position our friends occupy with reference to the question of the poor man, that it was unjust to him to levy 5c. on a pound of tea which cost 16c, when a man who bought 40c. or 50c. tea paid the same duty. And I say so still, and it is consistent with the propositions now before the House. I said it was unfair to make a man who bought a gallon of wine costing but 50c. pay 72c. duty, while a gallon costing \$4 or \$5 paid the same duty. Then there is the question of petroleum. Hon. gentlemen opposite thought it proper to impose 75 per cent. on it. Hon. members say: "Under these circumstances, you are taxing the poor man, and letting off the rich." In the case of tea there is no remedy—you must pay it; but, in the case of woollen goods and cotton goods, what is our object? I stated it distinctly, that when we could not manufacture an article in the country, there was no reason why we should exact from the English manufacturers a high rate of duty, and make our people pay it. But we impose a duty upon coarser material, for two reasons. Take woollen goods as an illustration; the coarse article can be manufactured in the country, and will not only give employment to manufacturers,

but
artic
Nort
—on
posit
we h
to th
frien
for th
upon
whea
make
duty
Mr
of wo
more
Mr
than
unfor
used
are no
making
mann
cloths
shoddy
hard e
it on,
he con
pants.
tured
use, an
the Un
perime
United
some t
a poun
besides
and wh
there,
ably, b
were ut
effect in
poor m
than h
hon. ge
of the c
derive
people v
in place
it is sai
uses, pa
the con
We hav
engaged
ware; t
turing \$
vince of
stonew
tariff wi