

I saw four
 nbering from
 not suppose,
 would have
 Montreal had
 not told me
 der, as their
 e through a
 an said he
 ice and had
 £5,000,000
 own and de-
 £3,000,000,
 . That was
 required to
 t was taken
 in the pros-
 an opposite
 e because I
 ve nineteen-
 this country
 p was with
 the revenues
 of Customs
 the banks
 those duties
 lect, at this
 r approached
 mbers of the
 ut the diffi-
 ay anything
 sition of the
 believe the
 their stand-
 om the obser-
 the matter,
 e sound, but
 reference to
 where, owing
 drawing from
 much to the
 the country.
 to mo duties
 \$4,000,000
 00,—will be
 e weeks, and
 money go to
 d that Bank
 ers specie for
 the com-
 and greatly
 unity. In
 resentations,
 persons trans-
 ut the Do-
 rangement to
 cause it was
 ber that this

policy would be adopted. The people were prepared for the change because they had confidence in the declarations made by the party leaders, and, therefore, went forward, as every member of this House would have done were he in business, anticipating the increased duties, and taking out of bond everything they could; it, therefore, became a question whether we would increase the existing embarrassments or remove them as far as possible. We did not say to our collectors deposit your money in such and such a bank, because the directors and managers are our political supporters. We said, whatever cheques you receive drawn on different banks, deposit in those banks to the credit of the Government. If we had placed \$800,000 or \$900,000 in a bank, half of which was without interest and half at four per cent., and it was found that that bank was using its influence in every shape and form in controlling and corrupting constituencies in the interests of this Government, then I could imagine how hon. gentlemen opposite might, with reason and with great power and effect, point to the corrupt and dishonourable conduct of the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a few remarks in reference to statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite; but, before doing so, I come to a point that was referred to by an hon. member from the Eastern townships, who made such an admirable speech this afternoon on the question of taxation. The people are told that this Government are levying new and heavy taxes on the people. Did I not state in my speech the other night that these were necessary because of the decreased value of goods, added to the depression in trade, that we wanted to-day, only the average of the money received from Customs in 1874-75? We are not asking as much as they received at that time, but we find that there will be, this year, a deficiency of \$2,400,000, and it is a question whether we will meet the matter boldly, saying that this amount must be collected, and our credit maintained, or make an open declaration that we are prepared for another deficit of two and a-half million dollars. Suppose our friends opposite were in power to-day, they could not provide for this deficiency in any other way than by asking Parliament to impose

additional taxes. There is a simple way of doing that, by adding to the 17½ per cent. list 5 per cent. As we received \$7,000,000 last year from goods paying 17½ per cent., the 5 per cent. additional would give \$2,000,000 more. It would be a simple way of obtaining it. It would not require many deputations or much calculation, and the Finance Minister would not be under the necessity of giving extended explanations as to the mode of levying it. That was the way our friends did before to the extent of 2½ per cent. Suppose they doubled it now, what would be the effect? We hear a great deal said now about interfering with the industries of Great Britain; on the other hand, we are *in toto* insulting the United States, because we are imposing new duties upon them. It appears to me, viewing it in a patriotic light, we ought not to create, by anything we say in this House, any unpleasant feeling, either in Great Britain or the United States, especially when it is not warranted by the propositions submitted to Parliament. Supposing 5 per cent. additional was added to the 17½ per cent. list, what would be the effect? I said the other night that the average duty collected on goods from Great Britain was 17½ per cent., and on those from the United States only 10 per cent, and if our friends opposite had been in power and had not imposed duties to encourage protection, because that would be at variance with their principles, they would put 5 per cent. upon the 17½ per cent. list, which would give an increased advantage to the United States instead of diminishing it. Still we hear from the other side, "Oh! this will create an unfriendly feeling in Great Britain towards Canada."

MR. MACKENZIE: You have no right to make a proposition for us, and then proceed to demolish it.

MR. TILLEY: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon for supposing they would be consistent. I was supposing that they could not levy a duty to protect our native industries. If the hon. gentleman says I am doing his party an injustice by supposing that they would be consistent, I am willing to take it all back. A word or two as to the effect our proposition will have on the manufacturing industries of Great Britain.