

Two reports were submitted to Parliament in favour of Confederation. The report of the majority was signed by seventeen, the report of the minority opposed to Confederation was signed by three, and the first name on the minority report was that of the Hon. Sir John Macdonald, late leader of the Conservative party. The second name was that of John Sanfield Macdonald, and the third name was that of Mr. Scoble, who then represented Elgin. The next day after these reports were presented, the Government was defeated on a resolution moved by the Hon. Wm. Macdougall for paying in the interim of the session, \$100,000 to the city of Montreal without the assent of Parliament. Then came forth the magnanimity of the Reform party in this country. They might have taken office then, but George Brown with that magnanimity of soul which ever characterised him—and he was a fitting representative of those who followed him—went to the Conservative party and offered them his support if they would take up Confederation and carry it out. After that, both parties united together and made Confederation a success. Tell me after these great measures and these great accomplishments by the Liberal party that our political sky is near our heads, and that our horizon is near the point of our fingers. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have detained the House so long. I thank hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House for the kind attention they have given me: and I thank you especially, Mr. Speaker, for the cordial courtesy you have extended to me during my remarks.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, we have listened for a good many hours to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. We have heard from him the same old story, which we have heard for a number of years past repeated on every platform in this country. We have heard his denunciations of the National Policy; a policy which has been approved by the people of this country on four different occasions, and a policy which I believe the people would again endorse to-day if the question were submitted to them. We have heard from the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) that the National Policy was a fraud, and that protection was a delusion and a snare, and had worked great injury to the people of this country. But, Sir, after all his denunciation of the National Policy generally he made one little exception in its favour. That, Sir, is characteristic of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. He went over a very great variety of arguments to try to show that protection was injurious to the people of this country, but when he came to the question of salt, he made a pause, and I believe he reversed in this particular the decision he had given on all other matters. Salt, according to the member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), was the one article in this country that required protection, and the only denunciation that he could find for the Government in reference to this matter was, because salt did not receive sufficient protection. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are in the same position as the member for Huron, in regard to special commodities of their own. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), for instance, was last year loud in his contention that pork and bacon should have a high duty placed upon

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

them, although, according to him, all other duties were wrong. We have also the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) in a similar position. He is not satisfied with the immense duties which are now placed upon candies and upon biscuits. He is engaged in that business himself and he is so badly satisfied with the 25 and 35 per cent. duty on these articles, that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) himself goes into a combination to increase the price enormously, in addition to the protection received by this 25 and 35 per cent. duty. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) also denounces the National Policy. He denounces all kinds of protection, but when he comes to the question of oil, he says: Oh, 100 per cent. is too little protection for oil. Then, Sir, we come to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He is against protection through and through, but he is interested in the wrecking-tug business, and he made a most vigorous speech not very long ago in this House, advocating that protection should be given to the Canadian wrecking tugs. And so, Sir, it goes through all the lists, until we come to-night to the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) who after declaiming against all kinds and forms of protection, says, that the article of salt upon which we had a duty of 15 cents per 100 lbs., or 42 cents per barrel, is not sufficiently protected. Why, I remember that for many years, salt was delivered on the cars at the railway stations in the county which the hon. gentleman represents, for 55 cents a barrel, and it was undoubtedly sold at a profit then, or else they could not continue to sell salt for so many years at that price. Now, if there is one combination in this country that is utterly indefensible, a combination that is doing more injury to the people and making them more dissatisfied than anything else, it is this combination on salt, which the member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) upholds and protects here this afternoon. Why, Sir, what is the history of that question? Two years ago, salt was sold for 55 cents a barrel delivered on the cars, but a combination was formed—an illegal combination as I contend—and salt was raised first to \$1 and then to \$1.10 per barrel delivered on the cars. The hon. gentleman told us that there were about 800,000 barrels of salt produced in his district, and if salt could formerly be sold at 55 cents per barrel, then there was an illegal, exorbitant and unnecessary profit to the men engaged in this business, of at least \$440,000 over the old price. Notwithstanding this the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) thinks that all protective duties are indefensible, and he gets up in his place to-night and upbraids the Government because they have made salt from Great Britain free of duty. He says that we have no protection for our salt in the eastern part of this Dominion. Well, Sir, we have a law which operates equally in every part of the Dominion, to the effect that salt from Great Britain comes in duty free, and the people of every part of the Dominion do, as they have a right to do, take the advantage of having the British salt free of duty. I presume that the objection the hon. gentleman makes is that the American salt is not brought in free of duty, instead of the British salt. We learned from his speech to-night that the hon. gentleman is wholly American in his views, and that his sympathies are not with Great Britain,