

press the country with the idea that they were going to give the country a free breakfast table, none of them had gone so far as the hon. member for King's. He (Mr. Donville) had also told the House it would not cost New Brunswick anything more for coal. He (Mr. Rogers) found by the trade returns that that Province imported 21,240 tons of anthracite coal from the United States, and 4,502 tons of bituminous coal. It was only fair to say that New Brunswick would have to pay duty upon coal to the amount of \$12,000 to \$15,000. He (Mr. Rogers) thought that the hon. member was equally unhappy in his reference to the shipbuilding industry of New Brunswick, when he spoke of it as "a little shipbuilding." Be that as it might, he (Mr. Rogers) thought shipbuilding was to the Maritime Provinces what the wheat-growing fields of the West were to them. He begged to dissent from this estimate. He found, on comparison with the United States, which had ten times our population, that the Dominion had about one-third of as much registered tonnage as they possessed. It was one of the links of the great carrying trade, which, with the railway and canal system, conveyed the products of Canada to a market in the Mother Country. That hon. gentleman had also attempted to show that in New Brunswick they paid less for certain articles now than they paid before the Union, and that their per capita tax had been lessened in that way. He had stated that in 1866 the price of flour was \$10.50, while molasses and sugar were also higher than now. Had he taken the trouble to go a little further back, he would have found some very different facts. He (Mr. Rogers) would give some quotations from the prices as shown by the *St. John Morning News* of the 5th November, 1862. Flour was then quoted at from \$5.75 to \$6; molasses 26c. to 30c.; sugar 7½c. to 8½c.; deal freights to Liverpool, 75s. to 77s. 6d., and deals were quoted in Liverpool at £7 17s. 6d. per standard, while to-day freights were 55s. to 60s., and deals £5 10s. to £6 per standard. This went to show that Confederation had very little to do with the prices which were controlled by the larger markets of the world. The same member had also stated that this

was not a cast-iron tariff, but would be tried for twelve months. He (Mr. Rogers) hoped it was not a cast-iron tariff, and that the Finance Minister would consent to its being modified in Committee so as to meet the requirements of the Maritime Provinces. He predicted, if it should remain as at present before the House, that, notwithstanding the many bands of Protection which its promoters had encircled it with, the very first time the electors of this country had a chance of pronouncing their views upon it, they would declare that it was not in accordance with their views.

MR. TROW said he had listened to the debate with a great deal of attention, and had failed to find any plausible or reasonable excuse given by the advocates of Protection, why any large proportion of the population should be taxed for the express benefit of a few. He considered it was the interest and duty of all Governments to legislate for the many and not for the few, to do the greatest possible good to the greatest possible number. Hon. gentlemen opposite were somewhat intolerant in their remarks, with reference to the elections of the 17th September last; some of them even asserting the doctrine that the people had decided the matter at the polls, and the House had no right to discuss the subject at all. He believed the elections were carried in many ridings by misrepresentation and deceit. In his section of Ontario the matter was not brought up in such a manner as represented here; but only a revision of the tariff was contemplated, not an increase of taxation upon every conceivable article used, from ten to fifteen per cent. higher than before. In looking over the returns of that "glorious victory," of which they had heard so much, he found that very little change in the electoral vote would have made a wonderful change; the party with whom he was identified would have remained in power. He could point to twenty-five hon. members, supporters of the Administration, the total of whose united majorities would not amount to one-half the majority of his hon. friend from North Oxford, and yet these gentlemen would boast that they represented the people. He found that the hon. member for Cornwall was returned by 38; the