

unreasonable expenditure. This is a grave and serious question, no doubt, but I feel that the possession of that magnificent territory, affording the facilities it does, and the inducements to emigrate from the Old World to come and settle it, places us in an entirely different position from that we occupied before we came into possession of it. So much with reference to the financial view of the question. I come now to consider the Tariff and its effects during the last twelve months. I stated, when I made my first Budget Speech, that the most serious effect predicted of the policy the Government had inaugurated was that it would operate injuriously to certain Provinces. Well, Sir, I undertook to show briefly that the Province especially to which that reference was made would not, in my judgment, suffer very materially under the operation of that Tariff; that was the Province of New Brunswick. An hon. member of this House made an effective speech on this subject last year, and he made an effective speech this year; but as his statements did not happen to be consistent with the facts, the effect of that speech will not be as great as it was at the moment of its delivery, when he was surrounded by his friends and congratulated upon his speech. That hon. member (Mr. Ross), in order especially to show that this Tariff operated injuriously to Ontario and New Brunswick, stated that, in consequence of it, the duties collected per head of the population in Ontario had been increased last year \$1.16 per head, whereas in Quebec they had only been increased 27c. per head; in Nova Scotia they had been diminished 9c. per head, but in New Brunswick they had been increased \$1.40 per head. Now, though the returns for last year only embrace some four months' operations of the Tariff, if such had been the actual results of that Tariff, then the hon. member would have made out a case with reference to the unequal bearing of this Tariff upon the Provinces of Ontario and New Brunswick. But, when I tell this House that the difference per head of the population during last year was 16c. instead of \$1.16 for Ontario—

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex): Last year? My statement was correct.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Your statement for last year is correct. I

have the returns for last year to show that the increase in Ontario was but 16c. per head, instead of \$1.16. It was 27c. in the Province of Quebec; and instead of its being in New Brunswick \$1.40 more per head, it is \$1.40 less.

Mr. MACKENZIE: How does the hon. gentleman count the entries at Montreal?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I am merely taking his statement, in which he refers to the increase of duties per head of the population.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If the hon. gentleman is giving figures; of his own, I want to know how he arrived at it.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: They are from the Trade Returns. If you turn them up, I will show you the figures; they speak for themselves.

Mr. ROSS: I referred to percentage.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Turn to the Trade Returns of last year, where there is a comparative statement of the *per capita* rate of Customs duties—it was from that, I suppose, the hon. gentleman obtained his data, and, if the hon. gentleman expects his statements to have any effect upon the country, he must not make statements so inaccurate and so open to contradiction. I advise him to state things as they are instead of reversing them, and stating there is an increase of \$1.40 instead of a decrease. That decrease took place in this way: In 1877-8, owing to the fire in St. John, there was a very large increase of imports into the Province of New Brunswick. That increased the rate per head on its population, and the result was that last year it was \$1.40 less. Then the hon. member stated, and the statement was responded to by the members of the Opposition around him, that that was a point it was hard to get over. It only shows to what the hon. member will resort to make a point against the Tariff. I desire to enlarge a little upon the effect of this Tariff on the Province of New Brunswick. An hon. member for Ontario referred to a petition from St. John complaining of the operations of the Tariff laid on the Table of the House, and having about 2,600 or 2,700 signatures. I find that the signatures to that petition numbered just the same as the votes recorded by the late Minister of Customs at his last election. Then, the petition had