

the words I made use of were, *in formá pauperis*. I did not refer to the manufacturers or any particular class of this Dominion, but took a broad ground, and asserted that any set of men, be they farmers or anything else, who, having invested a certain amount of money in any industry, and finding they were becoming bankrupt, came to this House and asked us to tax one portion of the people of this Dominion to contribute the means by which they could continue their business, came asking for charity, and in the strict sense of the term *in formá pauperis*. If the hon. gentlemen had allowed me the opportunity which any one conversant with the decorum—

Mr. COLBY—-I fear the hon. member is wasting his ammunition. I made no use of such an expression as "pauper" in my remarks, consequently he is astray. I made use of the word "cormorant," mentioned by another gentleman altogether.

Mr. MACDONNELL—The hon. gentleman, extending his remarks, said an attempt had been made to set one class against another—the farmers against the manufacturers. The false rumour became contagious, and the hon. member for St. John followed the same line of argument. I made no distinction whatever between any class of people of this Dominion, but I did say what I have repeated here to-night, and I am sustained in my position by the ablest writers. I am not the inventor of the term.

The hon. member for Stanstead said the fiscal policy of this Dominion has been for years one of protection. I say it has not, but has been a revenue policy.

There are two principles which guide legislators in raising revenue. The first and the statesman-like principle is that the revenue shall be raised in such a manner as to interfere as little as possible with the commerce of the country. That principle has been observed heretofore in raising our revenue. The second is that the revenue shall be distributed over the whole population so as to fall as equitably as possible on all classes. The term incidental protection, quite an absurd ex-

pression in itself, has arisen from this policy, but it is not protection.

The hon. member for Montreal West, not deigning to offer this House any arguments why the policy he advocates should be adopted, gives the valuable evidence of two gentlemen he met, their *ipse dixit* delivered on the street, that protection is necessary for this country. I am not satisfied with such evidence, nor can I understand by what reasoning or logic the hon. gentleman arrives at the conclusion that by raising the tariff and making things dear they will at the same time become cheap.

As to this wonderful and very sweeping amendment which the hon. member for Montreal West has submitted, it asks this House to increase the tariff upon the various industries of the country, and that irrespective, whether it is necessary for the necessities and Government of the country. The resolution asks this House to protect every industry in this country; in other words, to give protection to none, because the labourer, having to pay more for his food, clothing, and everything he uses, would claim and be entitled to more wages. The consequence would be the enhancing of the cost of every article consumed in the country. Therefore, the principle that I lay down is, that protection to all industries means protection to none.

Mr. BOWELL called attention to the fact that the resolution proposed to protect manufacturing industries only.

Mr. MACDONNELL having read the resolution, said it is all the same. What does the word manufacturing mean? It covers almost every industry. Therefore, I say it contemplates protection to every industry, *ergo*, protection to none.

Mr. OLIVER—I am very much pleased that the amendment is couched in such plain and unmistakable language. I was rather amused at the logic of my hon. friend from Montreal West. He said that notwithstanding the increase of 2½ per cent. on the duty two years ago, he had a conversation with two gentlemen, who stated that the duty of articles entering in to the manu-