

called, was largely imported. The cheap cloths of England were the only rivals of Canadian tweeds. He was not just then discussing the question whether it would be right or proper to interfere with the attire of the people, whether it would be well to enact sumptuary laws, but he would call hon. gentlemen's attention to the fact that, so far as the retaliatory policy which they advocated was concerned, there was no plea before the public, as evidence given before Committees of this House indicated, for an increased duty on American goods. With regard to the boot and shoe trade, a few days since one of the largest boot and shoe manufacturers in Montreal was in Ottawa and told him (Mr. Dymond) that he required no protection, that his goods were then selling in almost every part of the world; that goods, in his line, manufactured in Montreal, were being sold in England, in Australia, in New Zealand; that in every part of the globe they found a market, and did not need any protection. According to estimates of the production of boots and shoes in 1870-1, the whole production of Canada amounted to \$16,000,000. Against that, there was an importation amounting to from \$200,000 to \$300,000, included in which was a large amount of goods that could not be manufactured in this country at all. Therefore, there was no competition from the United States worth naming in the manufacture of boots and shoes. In connection with this branch of business, he would draw attention to the fact that, prosperous as this trade seemed to be, with no foreign competition to depress it, there was none in which a larger number of failures occurred, which showed that it was less rather than more protection it needed, and that such protection as did exist had been the cause of over-production, with all the disastrous consequences which followed in its train. He did not know whether the right hon. member for Kingston alluded last year to the duty on coal, but he was inclined to think the right hon. gentleman had not had much to say on the subject, while travelling through Ontario during the past summer. He (Mr. Dymond) had taken occasion on

a former evening, during a speech of the hon. member for Cumberland, to remind the latter that he was at fault on that subject. To-day, he again would remind the hon. member that, while, in his estimation, coal was to be the great factor in any arrangements having in view a National Policy, while he had spent weeks on a Committee during last Session endeavouring to show that a protective duty of 50c. to 75c. per ton was absolutely necessary for the revival of that branch of commerce, when he came face to face with the people of Ontario, and when he should have proved to them that they would derive benefit from a duty being imposed on coal, the hon. gentleman was dumb. There could not be found a single reference to coal throughout the hon. gentleman's Ontario speeches. Did he mean he was going to impose a duty on the people of Ontario against their will. Did he suppose that, if he forsook the Province of his former affection and tried to enter Parliament from an Ontario constituency, he could succeed without giving them the benefit of his views on that subject. What was the object of his summer campaign? He talked a great deal about various petty scandals, about the *Globe* newspaper, about almost everything that could be crowded into speeches hours in length, but not a single word about this great and prime factor in the interprovincial policy movement, the policy which all turned, in fact, upon imposing a duty on coal. To-day, the people of Ontario were left in utter darkness on this question, if the hon. gentleman's arguments were to give them light. There was a great deal of misunderstanding with regard to this question of a duty on coal. He (Mr. Dymond) believed that considerable injury had been inflicted on the people of Nova Scotia by the fact that they had been led to believe by their friends in the Opposition that they might obtain a duty on coal. He ventured to say that there did not live in this Dominion to-day any statesman who would dare, under any circumstances, to impose a duty on coal. And no one knew this better than the hon. member for Cumberland himself; no one could better understand