

that the word "protection" sticks in the nostrils of men who, like himself, do not reason upon the subject at all. I quite admit that, like the word "monopoly," it is a very offensive expression, and sometimes a bad name is made to go a long way for argument. (Hear, hear.) But I have never said that I entertained any such views as to protection, as would tend to prejudice the interests of the general community. But the hon. gentleman is mistaken, if he thinks that the enforced idleness of a very large portion of the population of this country is a consideration to be set aside by a mere sneer at the word "protection." I, Sir, am not one of those who, for the sake of mere theory, or idea, will consent to keep in idleness, as good and industrious a population as you will find in any part of the world. (Hear, hear.) Go to the workshops of Concord, Manchester and Lowell, in New England, and they will tell you that the most temperate, the most frugal, the most industrious and the most skilful workmen are the French Canadians who go there to find employment, and it is not for the hon. gentleman to taunt me with being the advocate of an exploded idea, because I maintain that some consideration is due to see whether we cannot devise a system under which these men should be enabled to stay at home, and find remunerative employment in their own country. I say that the exodus of this portion of our population is a consideration which no man ought to disregard. Go upon the railways between Montreal and Portland or Boston, and in some weeks you will find five, six, or seven hundred of the youth of both sexes going off. This is a fact which must be dealt with. I appeal to the Attorney-General East, whether he is disposed to disregard this very grave circumstance—that this class of our population are daily leaving us—whether he does not think it a fact with which the statesmen of this country ought to deal. (Hear, hear and cheers.) If it can be found that by the imposition of very moderate duties, giving what the Finance Minister would call incidental protection, duties, strictly speaking, imposed for revenue purposes, but which might incidentally benefit that class of our population, by turning their labour and industry to profitable account in this country—I think all classes in Canada would be found more magnanimous than my hon. friend opposite gives them credit for, and would be disposed to bear a little share of the burden, in order to keep Canada from being made a sacrifice market for the surplus stocks of Europe and America, and preventing the profitable occupation of our people. (Hear, hear.)

I now leave that part of the subject, and come to the arguments which have been adduced for making the change at the present time. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, says that the sooner we make these changes the better—that

it is quite evident that, after Confederation, there must be a great relaxation of the duties on imported articles in the direction of a lower tariff—and that it is better to prepare the trade for this great change by a modification of the tariff now, rather than that the whole shock should come at once. Better, he said, have two small shocks than one great shock. I do not know about that. If I were sentenced to decapitation, or had in prospect any other painful operation, I think I would rather have it over and done with at once. [Laughter.] I do not like a succession of small shocks; at all events when you apply them in such a way as to derange and keep the whole interests of the country in a condition of perpetual vibration. I think it would be better to have one policy adopted after grave and mature deliberation, than to have this preliminary measure, which will check the extension and even continuance of our foreign commerce, throw doubts on the position of our manufactures, and unsettle every great interest in the country. [Hear, hear.] But the hon. gentleman says that these proposed changes are an assimilation in every respect to the tariffs of the Lower Provinces. If that proposition were true, we would be disposed to listen with more attention to the scheme. But I wholly deny its truth. In woollens, and many other articles in the 20 per cent list, there is an assimilation to the tariffs of the Lower Provinces. But these do not constitute the whole trade of the country; and with respect to other articles which I am about to mention, equally important both to the revenue and as articles of daily consumption, instead of there being an assimilation to the Lower Province tariffs, there is a greater divergence than there ever was before. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend says that one of the great objections in the Lower Provinces to Confederation with Canada has been, that we were more heavily taxed than the population of the Lower Provinces. Let us see how far that assertion is correct; and, let it be remembered that, by my hon. friend's scheme, we are going to add \$1,300,000 to our taxation. (Hear, hear.) But let us see how it stood before—what was the taxation per head of every man in Canada, as compared with the taxation in the Lower Provinces. The taxation per head is as follows:—

In Canada	\$1 85
Prince Edward Island.....	1 69
New Brunswick	2 81

Hon Mr GALT—Where do you get your figures?

Hon Mr ROSE—Does my hon friend deny their correctness?

Hon Mr GALT—I do.

Hon Mr ROSE—Then I will put my hon friend himself in the witness box. (Hear, hear.) I have here a statement issued by the Finance Depart-