

their field with tares, was beyond endurance, and must be resented. He would notice the remarks of some of the previous speakers on this subject. He was surprised the other evening at the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Wellington, with regard to cheap money. He fell into the mistake of eulogising everything that belonged to our American neighbours, and rather depreciating what belonged to Canada. He was surprised to hear him state that cheap money was a sign of the great prosperity that existed in the Republic at present; that in New York they were now investing in their own bonds, and that money could be had on demand at 4 per cent. But cheap money was always not a sign of prosperity, but the reverse. When trade was prosperous, men engaged in commercial pursuits, and the demand for money was greater, and when trade got depressed, the money-lender became distrustful of all operations, and began to withdraw his money from business, and invest in consols, and what appeared to him undoubted securities, but which bore low interest. Then consols would rise in value, and the rate of interest would fall for want of proper investments. In all cases when Britain had been prosperous, money maintained a uniform value of about 5 per cent, showing a general trust and confidence in mercantile transactions, capitalists were willing to lend, and business flowed smoothly. But in times of depression like the present, in the great money-lending centres like London, money brought only 2½ per cent., while in Canada the supply of money was so limited that its owners could demand rates that suited them, though higher than those of the world generally. One point touched upon by the hon. member for Maskinongé related to a statement as to a discrepancy in the remarks of members of the late Administration, in reference to the value of flour in different localities, in the event of the adoption of such a tariff as the present. As that subject interested the portion of New Brunswick that he (Mr. Snowball) came from, he would refer to it. He could see no discrepancy in the statements made by these gentlemen. In the western section, where grain was raised, and a surplus existed, the duty would not really

enhance the value of flour, but in the Eastern Provinces, that had to depend on the others, it would be enhanced without any benefit to the Western farmer, who was to benefit so much by the tariff. They in the eastern part of New Brunswick enjoyed water communication, and got freights at such extremely low rates as to secure a reduction of those of the Intercolonial. Where he (Mr. Snowball) lived, he had to pay \$80 to \$85 a car load for flour from the West, when the same could be taken 180 miles further, to St. John, or 260 or 270 to Halifax at \$20 less. What was the cause? Clearly in St. John and Halifax, having to compete with such close proximity to the United States. The hon. member had told them that in the Lower Provinces, previous to Confederation, they were not educated to taxation. He was perfectly right. They were, however, apparently going to be taxed enough now. The Finance Minister had staked his reputation that they would not be taxed under Confederation above \$2.75 per head; to-day it was up to \$6.14 in New Brunswick, and, after the tariff got into force, would be up to \$9. He was surprised at the hon. gentleman making those changes, since his constituency would be so greatly affected by them. Hon. gentlemen opposite had observed that he had excelled himself in this his last great effort. He (Mr. Snowball) endorsed every word of that statement. Representing, as he did, a constituency almost entirely engaged in lumbering, fishing and ship-building, he had excelled himself in producing a tariff that would create widespread distress and woe not only in his own constituency, but the Province generally. Hon. gentlemen had stated in their speeches that Canada was in such a very deplorable condition. He would ask, was it worse than any other portion of the world? Was our trade utterly ruined! Had we not one advantage to offer seeking immigrants as an inducement to come to our country? Was the population of our country totally destitute? This, certainly, was what we had come to, judging from many of the speeches we had heard. He maintained that Canada was not in a worse, but rather in a better condition than many other countries, but would not say how long it would continue so if this