

Under those circumstances, I think there cannot be any unkind feeling towards Canada by the people of the United States. I see a moderate periodical, published there, remarks that the Canadian Government should have approached the United States Government on this question, before throwing down the gauntlet. We have twice approached them on this subject, and our propositions have been rejected; and the present Government have decided to wait till they make the advance, and show that they are prepared to meet us in a liberal spirit. I now come to some of the general objections that have been offered to the measure submitted to the House. Hon. members on the Opposition side have read letters disapproving of some of those propositions. All I can say is that, if any hon. member supposed that such a complete revolution in tariff arrangements as this tariff effects could be made without eliciting some complaints, he must have been very sanguine. All I can say is that it will be shown, by the amendments that I propose, that we have not made any very radical change of principle, and that, though gentlemen will ask for changes here and reductions there, and make complaints as to certain details, taking the Dominion as a whole, I have reason to feel that the majority of the country is with us in those propositions.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. TILLEY: We will see. What are the general objections to the tariff? My predecessor and the hon. member for West Middlesex (Messrs. Cartwright and Ross) complained that one effect would be to make people look to the Government and Parliament for relief. I was not surprised to hear my predecessor make that statement, because I think he distinctly asserts that it was impossible for the Government to do anything more than they had done for the relief of the people by legislation; but I was surprised to hear it from the member for West Middlesex. I thought I had followed him the last eight or ten years in the consideration of a question in which this Dominion is greatly interested. I had watched him as, step by step, he went on advocating such measures as he felt were necessary for the relief of the people from the vice of intemperance, and that he

took the ground that Parliament was the place to come to, as shown by the reform consummated in the Act passed last Session. Did my ears deceive me when my hon. friend declared that it would be a calamity if the people were taught to look to the Parliament and Government for relief from the great evils that existed in the land, when it was mainly to that source that he had educated the people to look? I have a word to say in answer to the arguments of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Extracts were read from his speech, the other night, and nothing that I could say would be so effectual as to read the speeches he made on former occasions. In answer to the hon. member for Oxford, did he not move for a Committee to enquire into the expediency of protecting the industries of the country? I think, when I was Finance Minister before, that he was one of the warmest advocates of Protection that I knew in Parliament. The hon. member for North Oxford, with Mr. Joly and the late member for Waterloo, and others, pressed upon me and upon Parliament the proposition to admit the production of beetroot sugar, for ten years, free of any excise duty, giving the producer a protection equal to 3c. per pound. This was the most thorough protective proposition made in Parliament, and the member for North Norfolk also joined in the demand. We have heard complaints about the promises made by gentlemen on this side to the electors at the last general election. These statements are made to destroy the effect of the elections of 17th September last. What did they say? That men were not bought by money, but by promises, and an hon. gentleman on the Opposition side has stated that there never was an election in Canada where there was so little money spent as in that one. Then, for the first time, we were before the country with a square issue, which was not money nor office, but a great question of principle. I know that many who supported me formerly then voted against me, because they had been told that, if they supported the Conservative party, their flour would cost a dollar a barrel more, and their coal cost more also, as the result of increased taxation; and the manufacturers were