per head, making the per capita for 1879 | \$1.40 less than in 1878, instead of \$1.40 more, as stated by the hon. member for West Middlesex.

MR. ROSS: The report of that speech, from which the hon. gentleman has quoted, is not correct. The Hansard report is not correct. I remember perfectly what I said. It is not so reported in the Toronto Globe, nor in any other report that I have It is a misstatement as to the difference between per head and per cent.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I looked at the Toronto Globe the next day, supposing that a speech delivered with such force and with such effect as that of the hon, member would have appeared in full; and I venture to say that no one was more congratulated by his political friends than he was in reference to that speech, and for the reason that he made reckless statements, of which I have given an example. I took down the remark at the time, and it was a question with me whether I would then refer to it, or wait until I had an opportunity of replying. When I looked in the Globe the next day, to my astonishment, I found the hon. gentleman, who was entitled to at least two or three columns, was favoured with very little space. I could not understand it, unless the explanation was that some of his colleagues had given the hint to the reporters that it would not do to publish the speech in full. saw the Hansard report, and found that my impression of the speech was correct. The hon, gentleman said (Hansard, page 644):

"Let me give you a fact or two, which will illustrate the working of the tariff. The percentage which Ontario paid upon dutiable goods she consumed last year was increased by $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; the Province of Quebec, $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.; Nova Scotia, $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; New Brunswick, $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.; British Columbia, 21-5 per cent.; Prince Edward Island, 2 per cent. So unevenly does this tariff rest upon the various Provinces that the Customs duties paid by Ontario have increased by \$1.16 per head; those paid by Quebec only 27c. per head; New Brunswick, \$1.40 per head; British Columbia, \$1.80 per head; Prince Edward Island, 27c. per head."

I noticed the statement at the time, and, if my memory serves me, called attention to it across the floor of the House, and the hon, leader of the Opposition called menced by the 20th April. to the hon. gentleman, as if to say, "the hon, the Finance Minister wishes to

speak to you," but I stopped. I thought it would be better to take it up afterwards. An error of that kind is very grave, and it is very important that these comparisons should be accurate and per-I did not find the fectly reliable. remarks in the Globe, but I looked in the Hansard, and found that, after it had received the hon. gentleman's revision, it corresponded with my notes taken at the time. Therefore, I read from these returns to show that, instead of the amount being as stated by the hon. gentleman, it was very different. As far as New Brunswick was concerned, if there was anything in the argument of the hon. gentleman at all, the National Policy affects it beneficially. I do not claim that, but for peculiar circumstances in 1877-8, the large importation of goods to replace those destroyed by fire, made the revenue larger than usual, and the population larger, and the difference in the duty was \$1.40 between that year and 1878-9, but it was a decrease per head instead of an increase. here a telegram which was sent to n.e from the Secretary of the Cotton Manu facturing Company, in St. Stephens, which I will read:

"ST. STEPHENS, N.B., March 25th. "Sir Leonard Tilley:

"Weldon's reference to St. Croix Cotton Factory excites great indignation here. Cotton mill enterprise progressing most favourably. Subscription list upward of \$30,000. Capitalists, regardless of politics, promise good additions. Town Council of Milltown vote to issue detentures for \$50,000 in aid. James Murchie, Judge Stevens, the Eatons, Boardmans, Charles F. Todd Chipman, and other leading men, all taking active part. The Committee wish this to be made as public as Weldon's statement.

> "DAVID MAIN. "Secretary to Committee,"

Then I took the liberty of telegraphing three gentlemen connected with proposed newindustries $_{
m in}$ Brunswick, as my statements with reference to them were said by hon. gentlemen opposite to be all moonshine. I wrote to Mr. Stephens, of Moncton, Vice-President of the Lock factory there, and asked what the condition of that concern was, and here is what he said:

"Machinery will be in and work com-

"H. T. STEVENS, "Vice-President, Lock Company."