

My hon. friend on that occasion referred to the industry of cheese. He wanted to know what the Government had done for the cheese industry of Canada, what protection they had given to it. The hon. gentleman dared not deny that it was a great success in Canada. He did not undertake to deny that, but he asked what had the Government done to protect the cheese industry of Canada. I can tell the hon. gentleman that this very same party that is now responsible for the legislation of this country, when in power before they fell in 1873, introduced that policy of protection and protected the cheese industry of Canada 3 cents a pound. I will ask the hon. gentleman if he dare go into his constituency or put his foot on a platform in my constituency and ask the electors of that county or of his own county to withdraw that protection to the cheese of Canada. I will ask, if that single industry has prospered with a duty of 3 cents a pound, whether it is not possible that other industries might prosper with a similar protection. If my hon. friend cannot see it, I am perfectly certain the farmers of Canada can see it to-day. Is my hon. friend afraid of a monopoly in the cheese industry? Well, I should say that there is not a single farmer in Canada but would like to see those monopolies very much increased. My hon. friend grew very warm, too, over the proposed resolutions of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, when he proposed to put a further tax upon wineceys. Why, he said, it enters into the use and consumption of every poor family in the country, and the Minister dares to tax the poor man's fabric, to charge upon it a heavier duty. My hon. friend is in trade. He knows the value of wineceys to-day, he knows that the duty was increased upon them long ago, and he knows that the prices have been very much reduced. I have been half a life in trade myself—over 30 years—and I never handled goods so cheap in all classes that my hon. friend has been dealing in, and that I myself deal in, and amongst them all I never handled any that show the reduction so much as cottons and wineceys. If my hon. friend is giving us a better quality at a lower price, if he does not impose higher charges upon these goods which enter into the consumption of every household in the country, then why should the Government be charged with taxing the poor man's family for what they wear? I give that answer to the hon. gentleman, and he knows that he dares not rise in his place and say that he does not get as good and even a better value than ever before in these lines of goods. My hon. friend, and a great many others on that side of the House as well as himself, referred in former Sessions of this House to the duty that was imposed on the farmer's implements of the North-West. The sympathy of those gentlemen was so great that one would have supposed that they, and not the gentlemen who lead the Government, should have been trusted with the destinies of that great country. We know how sympathetic they became, how they appealed to the Government in reference to the heavy rate of taxation they were imposing upon the agricultural implements of that Province. What are the facts? The hon. gentleman's whole course is changed to-day, and it turns out that it was not with the poor struggling settlers of that country that he was in sympathy, but with the manufacturers, who were to be the bloated aristocrats under the National Policy. Yes, the hon. gentleman dared to stand up and changed the whole of his past record in the House, and other gentlemen opposite spoke in the same direction and changed all their references to the high taxation imposed upon the people of that country, and turned round and sympathised with the unfortunate manufacturers. Did not my hon. friend say that the price of farming implements sent into that country was 50 per cent. lower than the manufacturers could afford to sell them for, that they were selling them for 50 cents on the dollar, that he knew manufacturers who had hundreds and thousands of implements they would be glad

Mr. HESSON.

to sell at 50 cents on the dollar? Where is his sympathy now for the poor struggling settler of the North-West? Has the price of implements increased? Did not the Government and other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House reiterate again and again to the gentlemen that, if you encouraged home production, you would create competition so keen and close that the prices would be reduced, and that the articles would not necessarily cost more to the farmers? Experience has verified the statements made on this side of the House at that time, but my hon. friend's visions of those days will lack verification, and he will find it by-and-bye necessary to change his tune once more, and to say that neither the manufacturers nor the farmers of that country are to be sympathised with or commiserated. The hon. gentleman referred to some photographic pamphlets, some literature for immigration purposes that he pointed out had been adorned with the photographs of the hon. Ministers. Possibly the hon. member had in mind a little pamphlet that was once circulated by an hon. gentleman on that side of the House, having in view, I presume, the settlement of a Province different from that of Manitoba and the North-West—the Province of Kansas. The hon. gentleman will recognize the leader of his own party in that pamphlet.

Mr. MILLS. Printed at the *Mail* office.

Mr. HESSON. It was printed as a business speculation, because gentlemen on that side of the House left themselves open then as they do now to be quoted by the American press and by the American speculators of railway and other land corporations, it was because they were always so unwise to leave themselves open in that direction that they had that sort of documents held up to them. The hon. gentleman waxed warm on that point, and said the photographs of Ministers adorned the pamphlets for circulation in the old county, and the result would probably be to induce such enormous immigration into this country that there would be nothing but starvation for the people of Canada. I think I can discover a remedy for that. Let the hon. gentlemen opposite issue a pamphlet and adorn it with the photograph of my hon. friend from North Wellington, and you will not have the people of the old country, if they attach any value to the utterances in the pamphlet, coming to this country, and so there will be no danger of starvation in consequence of over-immigration. My hon. friend referred to the enormous reduction in the United States debt. Now it is undoubtedly satisfactory, not only to this House but to the country and to the world, to know that the national debt of the United States has very largely decreased; and I trust the time may come in our country when we shall have reached a position, not only in prosperity and in general development, but in the settlement of the country as well, when we may also be enabled to point to a large reduction in our national debt. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that the reduction of the national debt of the United States since 1878 has been over \$425,000,000. Well, Sir, that is perfectly true. But when he was making the statement did the hon. gentleman forget that this state of things in the United States was only brought about by paying great attention to the industries of that country? Did my hon. friend forget altogether that he was talking about a country that was not blessed with free trade doctrines, or with philosophers such as my hon. friend and those associated with him on that side of the House? Did he forget that they had a policy of protection which, as compared with our own, I may safely say, is intensified three-fold? Had the hon. gentleman forgotten that in the history of that country, and until a very recent period, not even a bottle of patent medicine could be put up, nor a box of matches laid upon the shelf of a householder, without the Government stamp upon it? Did my hon. friend forget that they imposed