

already been covered. The subject has been ably discussed in all its branches.

We have a grand future before us, if we be true to more than our own private interests, and not be like the Roman guards, who sold at auction, to the highest bidder, the throne of their country.

My own views on the tariff question are steady, and ever have been since I had the honour of a seat in this Chamber. But desiring to bow to the will of the people, I sink them, and acknowledge that the present policy was sustained at the polls.

Until the same people give me to understand that they have changed their minds, I will carry out their views right loyally. Instead, though, of playing "Vicar of Bray," I would rather point out that there is danger ahead, and that the people here, like the people of the United States, are not going to be ridden to death by politicians. One stroke of the pen would let go the whole excise goods of the United States. I would like to know what would become of the frontier of Canada if we had to watch the flood of smuggled goods that would then come in at half the price ours would cost.

But, gentlemen, I have no desire to go, or appear to go, deeply into these matters. The problem of political economy, as applied to the wants of the different countries, is an exercise for statesmen, not for every pretender to tariff making.

I think it is perfectly safe to leave the operations of the present tariff and policy in the hands of the Government. There is a man at the head of the Government who is a statesman as astute as any on this continent. When that statesman considers that the true interest of this country demands an alteration in the tariff, he has sagacity and patriotism enough to adopt it. I think it is perfectly right and safe for us to wait until we see the necessity for a change in our system before making one. I may, perhaps, be inclined to think that a change will take place by degrees in the near future; but until a change shall take place in public opinion I am satisfied to bow to the will of the people.

HON. MR. TURNER—In the absence of the hon. member from Belleville, I should like to say a few words in reply to the hon. member from Hopewell, on the

cheese question. Before the National Policy was adopted as a general principle, there were to my knowledge three articles to which the protective principle had been applied. These were vinegar, tobacco and cheese, in all of which articles we control our own market, and, as regards the latter, we are now large exporters. I can recollect—it is not very long ago—when there was no merchantable cheese made in Canada. There was a duty of 3 cents put on cheese, and from that time the improvement dates. Prior to that the duty was nominal. This increase in the duty was followed by the establishment of cheese factories, and an extraordinary increase in the production, and I now say it, and assert it boldly, that the basis of the improvement in the production was this increase in the duty imposed.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I do not know that it is worth while for me to discuss the question any further. The debate has been a long and a tedious one, and the hon. gentlemen who have fired their shots and spoken in the negative on the question have left the House. Many of their arguments I should like to review, but as they are not present I shall refrain from doing so; however, I will say a very few words. I will take New Brunswick first, as from that province comes the deepest and loudest howl. We have heard of the condition of affairs there; but the assertions to which we have listened are not borne out by the facts; anyone who looks at the imports and exports for the last five years will see that the condition of trade in that province is not as bad as it has been represented. The hon. gentleman from Albert made some allusion which I did not understand about the Chinese in British Columbia. He imported that question into this discussion, though I cannot see what bearing it has upon the trade policy of the Dominion; but I will say this that there are Chinamen fully as intelligent and as well informed as he is, in many parts of British Columbia and in China. The hon. gentleman did not confine himself to the question at issue, the trade policy of the country, but went beyond it into abstract questions which it is perfectly impossible to answer, and if it were possible, would be of no benefit to any-