

the people of Ontario, but most burthensome to the other sections, to the fishermen and the great masses of the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well as Quebec, for it was a well-known fact that a large quantity of breadstuffs were yearly taken in the latter province from the United States. Then as a part of this great National Policy, a duty was imposed on foreign coal, as a means of propitiating Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec taxed to satisfy Ontario! Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick were to be burthened to please a minority in Nova Scotia! Nothing could be more calculated to create dissention and disturb the harmonious working of Confederation than such legislation."

Almost prophetic.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—He has lived to see his error.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—His words were almost prophetic, if one reads this in the light of the present day. Both in the west and in the east, even in the province from which my hon. friend from Lunenburg has the honor of coming—that province which he was kind enough to assure us the other day, was reposing in contentment, peace and happiness—

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Even in the legislature of that province, a resolution, having for its object the dismemberment of the Union, was introduced and adopted. The sentiments expressed by the representatives of that province, one reads with sadness, but yet I have no doubt they were largely the sentiments of the people of that province.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It came from an effete Government that would not allow the question to be decided at the polls.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I hope the hon. members of the Administration will listen to the wise sayings of their colleagues:—

"He believed that a protective duty was unjust and could not be supported on true principles. He was also convinced that there was nothing more illogical than that incidental protection which some said was one of the objects of the measure. The object of a

tariff was revenue, and in order to protect the manufacturers sufficiently it was necessary to interfere with revenue. \* \* \* He considered it a most unsound principle to diminish the number of articles on the free list. The policy of the country hitherto had been to follow the example of England, &c.

"Was the House ready to subsidize every little enterprise that might be established in this country, without reference to the masses of the people? If it was the wish of the Government to encourage the salt interest artificially, it was better to give it a direct subsidy than to increase the cost of the article by a tax on consumers; and the same argument would apply to the coal of Nova Scotia."

Just as my hon. friend from Ottawa made the observation the other day, which I have no doubt was very correct. The hon. gentleman from Saugeen continued:

"If it is the intention to encourage monopolists at the expense of the people, then let it be done directly out of the consolidated fund, and we would soon know what it would cost.

"Far wiser to subsidize the few monopolists directly out of the public revenues.

"A benefit to a few non-residents—coal mine owners of Nova Scotia—would not be a benefit to the great mass of the people of Nova Scotia. \* \* \* The tariff, therefore, so far as it touched salt and coal, was only intended to benefit monopolists to the injury of the great mass of the people.

"The inland shipping of Ontario would also be injuriously affected \* \* \* and the result generally injurious to our marine.

"Yet this was called a great 'National Policy,' which was to protect all interests and please all sections, and lead to the renewal of reciprocity with the United States!"

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It has done all that.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I was not aware of it. It continues—

"What was more absurd than to suppose that an additional taxation of ourselves to the amount of \$200,000 was going to have the effect of forcing the Americans to renew free trade with Canada. If true, that a mutual interchange of our products would be the best for both countries, we should receive all that we required from them untaxed, or in other words at the lowest possible rates for ourselves. (hear, hear.)

"What could be more illogical than to say to Americans—'If you will not untax what is consumed by your people, we shall impose a tax on what is consumed by our own.'"

"If we could make the Americans pay the taxes, then there would be some reason in the arguments of gentlemen opposite; but so long