would vote against it because it was part of a general plan of which he did not approve—a general plan—every item and every feature of which was as objectionable as this duty upon coal.

Mr. PLUMB said he was surprised to hear such a speech as that which had been made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). had challenged the consistency of his hon, friend the member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper). In reference to that tu quoque argument he should only say that his own course hardly entitled him to raise any question of consist-ency. He (Mr. Plumb) had seldom heard a more ingenious argument than was used by that hon, gentleman in a certain speech he made on Protection. which was so conclusive that the hon. gentleman had never yet been able to answer it himself, though he had attempted to do so. The hon, gentleman had just stated that the consumer always paid the duty. He thought that fallacy had been exploded often enough. There was no doubt that the consumer paid the duty on imported articles which the country did not produce. But to tell him (Mr. Plumb) that the barley which was raised in Amherstburg or Windsor, and was sold competition with the barley raised on the other side Detroit River, did not pay the 15c. per buchel duty, and the expense of carrying it across, was to tell him what no Amherstburgh farmer believed, and he gave the hon. gentleman credit for too much intelligence than to think he believed it himself. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Mc-Gregor) had given a schedule of prices at which coal could be delivered in Canada. An hon, gentleman who was perfectly acquainted with the prices of coal in the States, had informed him that this schedule was not entirely He did not accuse the hon. correct. member for Essex of having made an incorrect statement, but he placed against it that of an equal authority. Coal of the best quality could not be delivered in Toronto at less than \$5 to \$6 per ton. It was no argument to quote the price of coal entirely inferior The speech to that under discussion. of the hon. the Minister of Militia was

entirely deficient in argument. It was the oft-repeated speech of Nova Scotia's wrongs and difficulties, and was marked only by its utter irrelevancy to the matter in hand, and its utter want of logical connection. He wanted to make Canada a cheap country; but, was that a cheap country where there was scarcity of employment? A cheap country was where a man got a good day's wage for a proper day's labour. It was mockery to talk to a starving man about low prices, and there was no policy which could tend more to reduce the people to that state than that pursued by the Government. Then there was the spectacle, certainly an amusing one, of the hon. member for North Oxford, stating that a few years ago, when he was an ingenious youth of fifty summers, he had brought in a tariff resolution, but that he had then had no experience and did not know the mischief he was doing. But he was no tyro then, and his attempt now to excuse his course then, on the ground of inexperience, must afford amusement to every one who has listened to the arguments brought forward. He said the manufacturers brought such a pressure that they actually misled him, and that, after the experience of twelve months, the measure gave great dissatisfaction. The circumstances when the hon. member for North Oxford brought in his resolution, and the circumstances to-day, were so widely different that no comparison could be made between the two periods. Up to the Fall of 1873, the great question which had been agitated since then, the question of Protection, had not been pressed upon the country. For years Canadians had been selling the Americans everything, owing to their system of inflation, and they could sell nothing in return. Everyone who knew anything of the condition of the country knew that this was an utter fallacy, and no gentleman should make the argument which was made by the hon. members for South Waterloo and North Oxford and a host of other hon, gentlemen on the other side of the House; though he gave them the credit of supposing that they did not use this argument with any sincerity, for it was perfectly apparent that the condition of things