

cently the inhabitants of the town of St. Stephens were called together to consider the propriety of establishing a cotton factory there—they having sent to the United States for experts to select a site—that a site has been selected, that stock is being subscribed, that American capitalists are willing to build it and put it in operation, if their taxes are remitted for twenty years, that the expenditure involved in such an enterprise will be between \$300,000 and \$400,000; that a company with a capital of \$60,000 is being formed for the manufacture of nuts and bolts, and that various other interests of that kind have grown up in that Province within the past six months, the whole requiring altogether a capital of \$1,000,000—when I mention all these things, I ask whether, under those circumstances, Ontario or Quebec has exhibited a greater spirit of enterprise than has the Province of New Brunswick, bearing in mind, at the same time, that in proportion to population, our one million of capital is equivalent to six millions in the Province of Ontario, or four and a-half millions in the Province of Quebec. Sir, a characteristic scene took place since I came into this House this afternoon. I heard of a petition being circulated in St. John, asking that certain amendments be made to the Customs Tariff, and if I heard correctly the late Minister of Customs presented such a petition this afternoon. If the object of this petition was to influence the Government when making their changes in the Tariff—considering that it has been in circulation for a month among those who do not agree with us politically—why was it left until just before I rose to make the Budget Speech. I say, Sir, that this petition was said in St. John to be a piece of political clap-trap, and it has proved itself to be so. It has been said that the imposition of a duty on corn and cornmeal is unpopular, and I know that duty is unpopular in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

MR. MACKENZIE: And in Ontario, too.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: And if we were legislating here solely for these Provinces we would not have asked for its imposition, but it was part and parcel of

our policy; and what is the fact? It will be seen by a return on the Table of the House that the duty collected on corn and cornmeal in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick has been nearly or quite met by the reduction of the duty on molasses consumed during the same period. It will be found that though in New Brunswick we consumed 55,000 gallons more than for the corresponding six months, the duty collected is something like \$9,000 or \$10,000 less, in other words, the reduction of duty on tea and molasses will balance what is paid by the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia on corn and cornmeal. Still not a word is said on this point by hon. gentlemen opposite, their object being to alarm people as to the effect the Tariff is having on particular industries in these Provinces. Then we come to the duty on flour, and I have heard it stated that this is an Ontario Tariff. It will be found by the returns on the Table that during the last six months New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have not paid one dollar more on coal and flour than has Ontario, in proportion to population. We may expect objections to provisions in this Tariff, but on looking at its operation throughout, it is a marvel to me how we could have framed a Tariff that bears so equally on all portions of the Dominion. I am quite prepared in the discussion of this subject to have hon. gentlemen opposite differ with me on this point, but let us go to the returns and form a judgment from the facts submitted to the House. It is said the greatest enemy of truth is prejudice, and its greatest friend time. Time is solving this question with reference to the Tariff. The main discussion on the Tariff will be this Session. The result of another year's experience will be such that our friends opposite will be then veering their course for a moderate protective policy, in order that they may meet the desires of the country. It is said this policy has damaged the country generally.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." Well, the hon. gentleman and his organ for five months after the passage of this Act, endeavoured to show that the country was