

cotton. But the duties on those articles have been raised. It is true we may get cheaper cottons from England by and by, but at the present time the duties must be considered as having been increased. Further, they wanted the duties removed from dressed and undressed lumber. No change has been made under the tariff, as under the favoured-nation clause England will be unable to take advantage in this respect. Considering these facts, it is unreasonable to say that the people of Manitoba and the North-west are satisfied with the tariff? It cannot be so, and we must look for another reason why candidates have been elected to support the present Government. I consider the decision of the electors was largely given on account of the settlement of the school question, because the people of that country were very greatly interested in that question and are not entirely dissatisfied, although they complain, of the settlement effected. The hon. gentleman should go over the subject again, and reconsider the reasons he has put forward.

The hon. gentleman said that industries of the country had been struck by the tariff. No doubt such is the case, or there would not be deputations here asking for items to be reconsidered. The tariff has injured several interests so as to compel manufacturers to close their doors. I have here a Montreal paper which mentions several establishments that have been closed. Here is a sample :

But if the cotton men look with uncertainty to the future, it is still worse with the wire industry. The Dominion Wire Company, whose works are at Lachine, closed down the barb-wire department on Saturday afternoon, and the key will be turned in the other branches of business as soon as the company have worked off what raw material they had in hand. In fact, the darkest view of the case was taken in the office of the company on Saturday afternoon. They state that at their Lachine works 250 hands will be thrown out of employment, and a great many of these men have been with the company since they started operations. It will be most gratifying to the tariff reformers, that not only will the twelve barb-wire factories be closed down, but that even as early as Saturday a representative of the Consolidated Steel Company, of Pittsburg, was in Montreal, prepared to gobble up the trade that Hon. Mr. Fielding had so proudly placed within their grasp.

There is no wonder that manufacturing industries were struck by the tariff. They were, however, struck in the wrong way, in such a manner as to take employment from our people and from our wage-earners, to whom it should be the duty of the Government to give all employment possible.

The hon. member for North Wellington said the bounty system is the proper system to compensate iron manufacturers. Only a year or two ago that hon. gentleman strongly condemned the bounty system when the late Government introduced provisions for the granting of bounties in connection with the manufacture of iron, but now he de-

clares that this is the proper system. What was wrong two years ago cannot be right to-day. The hon. gentleman must either have a bad memory, or he must be very inconsistent. If it was an evil then, I am sure it is an evil at the present time.

The hon. gentleman went on to say that the proper way to collect duties is by a revenue tariff. The claim is made that this is a revenue tariff, and that the distinction between this tariff and the old tariff is that the protectionist feature has been abolished. I take issue with my hon. friend on those grounds. I hold that the proper principle on which to frame a tariff is not on the revenue principle. Why do I say so? Because it means that when a revenue tariff is established taxes must be placed on necessaries of life that come in from other countries and which cannot be raised or manufactured here. Why; because, if they cannot be made or raised, and are consumed and imported, there is a duty paid on them, and that duty means revenue. Sir, that will result in what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did when he was in power in 1874, namely, the placing of a duty on tea, on coffee, on rice, and upon these lines that cannot be made or raised in Canada. That is a revenue tariff, but it is not raising a revenue tariff to put a duty upon goods that can be produced in Canada. Such a duty is put on for protective purposes so as to shut out foreigners and to give Canadian manufacturers and Canadian labourers employment at home. Therefore, the tariff now proposed cannot fairly be claimed to be a revenue tariff. So far as the first features of it are concerned, it is as protective as was the late tariff, and when hon. gentlemen opposite say that their new tariff is the proper system upon which to raise a revenue, they either do not understand the principle of a revenue tariff, or else they do not understand the principle of protection.

I hold that the proper principle upon which to raise our revenue is to raise it upon the lines of goods that can be made and produced in Canada, for if we make these goods and raise these goods, then we do not require to bring them from abroad. But, sometimes outsiders will send their goods in here when they find it a better market than the market at home, and so they are obliged to pay duty on them, and that duty makes up our revenue. That is the difference between a revenue and a protective tariff. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) said, that every particle of protection was taken out of the tariff, but he ought to know that protection is not removed by any means through lowering the duty 1 or 2 per cent. Protection applies, rather to the class of goods a duty is levied on than to the rate of duty charged in the tariff.

I shall now, Mr. Speaker, deal with the financial statement for a minute both as