

the company come back another year and another final arrangement is entered into. The Government have not carried out their pledges, and have changed their railway policy at different times. At one time they were going to build the road for \$79,000,000; at another time the leader of the Government said he was going to make sufficient money out of the lands to build the road without any expense to this country. He also stated that some \$58,000,000 were to be received from the sales of land up to 1891. They have not yet received \$1,000,000, clear of expenses, and they will have to hurry up in order to obtain the other \$57,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of being the party of progress with respect to this railway. I will not concede that claim, but I think they might appropriately call themselves the reckless party. They should make haste slowly. We all appreciate the advantages of a trans-continental railway, but it should be built as the resources of the country will permit and in a prudent, economical manner. The Government railway policy is very unsatisfactory. Their land policy has also been most unsatisfactory, and the population expected is not now to be found in Manitoba and the North-West. What do we find they now have on their hands? They have a second rebellion in this short history of the country. All this might be obviated by a little care in explaining matters to the people who are not so well versed as we in Ontario are with the usages of land holding. I am sure the first rebellion might have been avoided; and I daresay if the people of that country had proper representation, if they had anyone to see to their wants, or listen to the complaints and alleged grievances, the present trouble might have been averted. It is also to be noticed that the tone of political morality in this country is not in a very satisfactory state. There are too many of our people who have no faith that public affairs can be administered in a straightforward and honest manner, though I do not subscribe to that doctrine myself. We are told that you might as well preach in the wilderness as try to inculcate the doctrines of sound political morality in the country at the present time. I believe this feeling prevails to an alarming extent, though for my part I do not despair of a better time coming, when public matters will be in a more satisfactory state. I am sorry the right hon. gentleman is not in his place, though whether he were present or absent, I should be sorry to say anything disrespectful of him. I hold, however, that there has been and is a great deal of political corruption in the country, and for the last thirty or forty years that hon. gentleman has been the central figure in all political matters. I therefore hold him, to a large extent, responsible for the demoralisation of the rising politicians of the country; the tendency of his tactics has been to develop a very bad school of politicians. However, as the debate is wearing on and hon. gentlemen are very patient, I shall close very soon, though I have a great many more notes.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

Mr. COCKBURN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks I cannot go on, and that is the reason he is so liberal on this occasion, but I am not exhausted by any means. I have endeavored to give a fair *exposé* of public matters according to my light. I think the figures I have given will bear investigation, and I challenge hon. members to investigate them, for I am not at all afraid to stand by my utterances. I am also sure that my deductions and general impressions will commend themselves to all intelligent and well informed people who are not biassed by party considerations. I have endeavored to do the tariff as much justice as possible. As I have already stated I believe it has already stimulated some industries of this country and we have had good specimens of manufacture produced in Canada, which is a gratifying circumstance; but I say that, taking the matter all in all, the tariff

Mr. COCKBURN.

has been inimical to the general interests of the country. With regard to the policy we should pursue, I think it would be well for the Finance Minister to return as soon as possible to a revenue tariff. In 1873 we, on this side of the House, stated that the effect of the tariff would be to cripple the milling industries and the carrying trade of the country, and we know that the milling industry is now in a depressed state, and that the carrying trade has been injured. We also stated that the effect of the tariff would be very injurious to the Maritime Provinces. And such undoubtedly has been the case. The effect of the tariff has been to develop some inter-provincial trade, but this has been done by a forcing process, and it has forced out of the Maritime Provinces some of the best men of the country, by injuring various lines of business. We were bidding fair to take the position of being perhaps the greatest maritime people in the world, in proportion to our population, but the attempt to develop this inter-provincial trade has had the effect of injuring the trade of small carriers—men who, with small ships, did the carrying trade for local ports of the Maritime Provinces, and carrying products to the eastern ports of the United States, and bringing back cornmeal and other provisions. I cannot conceive of any tax that could be more unjust than the tax on cornmeal, for it is an article which does not come in competition with us, as we are not producers of cornmeal. I hold, therefore, that the Maritime Provinces have been injured, notwithstanding the remarks of some hon. gentlemen who are more interested in, and should be better acquainted with, those Provinces than I am. There may be some coal producing counties which have been benefitted, but I do not think that even they have realised the benefits to the extent which has been claimed for them. Hon. gentlemen may point to the fact that they carried the country; they may point to the general elections and the bye-elections at the polls, but they do not count for anything. We did not get a fair election. We had not a fair election in 1882, on account of the gerrymander and the sops which were thrown to the Maritime Provinces and to many sections. As to the bye-elections hon. gentlemen opposite act in a very different way from what my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) acted when he was in power. They are very careful about opening constituencies, and when they do open them they put on all possible power to carry them, instead of relying alone on the integrity and intelligence of the people as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did. Of course the fates were against us at that time, but the one thing needful for the people in the Maritime Provinces is—

Mr. IVES. Money.

Mr. COCKBURN. Yes, I know, that making money is the politics of some hon. gentlemen. The one thing most needful for the people of the Maritime Provinces is a fairly considered reciprocity treaty in the natural products of the country, as this would help the coasting business and other lines of trade in those Provinces. In Ontario they do not care so much about it, though it would be an advantage to the farmers who have horses, barley, &c., to sell and other produce for the American markets; and it would also be a benefit to the lumbermen. There has been discussion in this debate as to who pays the duty. I believe that in some cases the consumer pays the duty, and in others the producer, but it is generally conceded by those who have studied the matter that in barley and in some other articles it is divided, each paying one-half, which would leave a margin for our farmers and lumbermen. I see that my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is present, who has been agitating for the removal of the duty on cornmeal, a movement in which he will have my hearty support.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should be happy to know that we could be successful, but I am afraid not.