

proach the Government for not having put a duty on foreign wool. This gentleman was, perhaps, not aware that this imported wool could not be produced in this country. It was a fine, delicate wool that Canadian sheep could not produce. Naturally, Canadian manufacturers who made use of this article required, for the best quality of goods, this foreign wool. By imposing a duty on this import, the Government would have denied the protection required by Canadian manufacturers of woollen goods. The farmer could take his wool to the manufacturer and bring back the cloth he needed for his clothing, and he could, moreover, sell his surplus wool for cash. He thought that as legislators it was their duty to teach the people how to live and clothe themselves at home rather than to flatter popular prejudices. The farmer was happier when he wore clothes made by his wife than he was to-day, wearing, as he did, clothes manufactured in England or the United States. Then he had gold and silver in his strong-box, but, to-day, having contracted the habit of purchasing these products abroad, he had neglected this former national and domestic industry. Did the farmer enjoy the Protection that the new tariff seemed destined to grant him? Were the advantages he obtained greater than the few sacrifices he was obliged to make as a citizen of the State? He thought so. The protection upon oats, rye and barley, would give him profits greater than the few duties he would have to pay on certain articles of luxury. It must be admitted that every one was obliged to contribute towards defraying the expenses of public administration. The Government could not be maintained without revenues; public improvements could not be made without money. The people who asked for these public improvements understood this. With regard to these taxes, it was astonishing to hear the Liberal party blame the Government for the present increase, for this party, whilst they were in power, had considerably increased taxation. If, to-day, the Government was placed in a rather awkward position, which required an increase of revenue, the cause of this might be laid at the door of the late Liberal Administration. But, without wishing to enter into recriminations

against the late Administration, he thought that the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition was a proof that this increase was necessary, for in the first part he stated that, in order to maintain public credit, he was ready to admit an increase of taxation; what he condemned was that the present distribution of the duties did bear equally on all classes of society. With respect to this, the leader of the Opposition had, the previous evening, while speaking of Protection, endeavoured to show that it would not have the expected result, and speaking half seriously, he pointed to the case of several American workmen who had come to seek employment on the Welland Canal. This example did not prove that Protection was not advantageous to the United States, but it showed that the late Premier, in giving out contracts, favoured American rather than Canadian contractors. Another example was that at Hamilton a large asylum had been built, the contract had been given to Americans, who, naturally enough, had brought from the States all the material required, as well as the workmen. Well, if the hon. the leader of the Opposition had then been mindful of Canadian workmen, he would have granted them Protection by giving them this work. There was contradiction on the very face of the opposition brought against the new policy by the Liberal party. Some said that it would increase the burden of taxation; others, and these were the principal members of the Opposition, stated that the revenue was going to decrease. That was, evidently, paradoxical; there was a flat contradiction between these two statements, for revenue was taxation. If the revenue decreased, the people would, necessarily, have less taxes to pay. This contradiction showed what a difficulty hon. members who opposed the new tariff, without knowing exactly how to do so, were in. If they were logical, they ought all to maintain that the Protective policy meant an increase of taxation, and that the revenue was going to be considerably increased. But there was nothing surprising in contradiction even, from a party which did not seek for the interests of the country, but rather endeavoured to excite popular prejudices, in order to regain power. Another remark