

look to the future, and calculate as to imports and exports, and so on ; so it is very different. (Applause.) But, when he was putting this as he did, why did he not put it as it was, and say : "Gentlemen, this Finance Minister, the Finance Minister of the Conservative Government, left us this last year with a surplus of \$6,000,000 ; the ex-Finance Minister, Mr. Cartwright left you with a deficit of \$11,000,000 in five years ; which would you rather have to represent you, the one who left you with a surplus of \$6,000,000, or the other who left you with a deficit of \$11,000,000 ?" That would be the way to put it, if his argument was correct. (Cheers.) That is one part of the hon. gentleman's speech. I was just thinking it would be a fine thing for him to go over and make a speech to the American young Liberals against the National Policy there. Would it not be a nice thing for the hon. gentleman to stand up there and say to the young Liberals in the United States : "Boys, see here, the Government of the United States have put 35 cents a pound duty on leaf tobacco coming from Canada, and so you will have to pay 35 cents a pound more for your tobacco." Why, they would say, every little boy would say : "That is not so ; I can buy tobacco here for 5 cents a pound." Suppose he said the poor man's clothing cost 60 per cent. more because of the tariff on coarse goods from Canada or England, they would say : "No ; we have no Canadian or English goods here for the poor man ; we manufacture our own goods, we grow our own wool and make our own clothes, and we do not pay a single cent duty." This speech of the hon. gentleman, where he tells the people that the poor man has to pay 50 per cent. on cloth, and 70 per cent. on other goods, 54 per cent. on mantle cloth, and so on, would not that be a fine speech for a pamphlet for an American emigration agent in foreign countries ?

#### WHY THE UNITED STATES OBJECTS.

I imagine I see an American emigration agent in a foreign country saying : "The United States is the place to go to. It is true that we have protection and that they have protection in Canada, but the protection that we have is not the same as they have in Canada. In the United States we protect the poor man. He pays nothing for his coarse cloths in the way of duty, but here is the Hon. Edward Blake's speech, the leader of the Reform party in Canada, and he says it is the poor man who pays for the protection in Canada. Go to the United States, where the poor man is protected and the rich man has to pay the duty, and not to Canada, where the poor man has to pay all the burdens." Would not that be a nice pamphlet for a Yankee emigration agent ? What do we find in the *Boston Herald* ? The *Boston Herald* says Canada is over-protected, that the high protection has made agricultural implements dearer than before the National Policy ; and what do they give ? They give the *Globe* for their authority. There would be another nice little sheet to put in the American emigration pamphlet,