

Now, Sir, as stated by the highest authorities in the great party opposite, that is the issue upon which the two parties went to the country. We have never changed. From 1878 we have consistently maintained the vital importance to Canada of protecting Canadian industries, and we believe that the policy ratified on four different occasions by the electors of the country in an emphatic manner, was ratified because under that policy the country had prospered, as it had failed to prosper under the contrary policy of free trade pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. I say, Sir, that on that issue we went to the country. Free trade versus protection, as stated by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), a revenue tariff and the freeing of raw material, such as coal and iron from the duties on them, as stated by the First Minister. Well, some rather curious things have occurred, and I do not believe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) will himself say to-day that he has obtained his majority from the electors of this country on that great issue clearly and succinctly stated and put before the people of Canada. Some facts to which I will draw attention, I think, warrant me in the conclusion that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) found, as did the great leader of his party on a previous occasion. In the contest of 1887, the Hon. Edward Blake, face to face with the electors of the country, made a somewhat remarkable speech, in which he practically stated, that if the Liberal party attained power, their policy would not be to disturb the great manufacturing industries of this country, and he frankly admitted that he had arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary, practically to adopt the tariff as it existed. Now, Sir, as is well known, that hon. gentleman was not supported by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in that view of the case, and when we met in Parliament, Mr. Blake shortly afterwards resigned his position as leader of his party, and subsequently ceased to be a member of Parliament. Very much the same state of things has occurred during the present contest. I believe I am warranted in saying that the hon. gentleman opposite has received no mandate from the people of this country to break down the protection that is now given to our industries, and to adopt a policy of free trade or a revenue tariff policy. At a public meeting held at Westmount on the 19th of May, 1896, as reported in the Montreal "Witness":

Mr. Madore impressed upon his hearers that he was utterly in accordance with Mr. Laurier's policy. He was with him in tariff reform and also in his policy with regard to the reform in the general administration of public affairs, also on the question of Manitoba schools. * * * Speaking of the reform of the tariff, of which he was decidedly in favour, he said it did not mean a radical change, but it was purely and simply a legislation on a better scale with regard to the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

duties on different goods. The tariff reform had been a necessity for more than one year. It would be beneficial to every one, including manufacturers, and would not injure them as the Conservative party makes it appear. It would lessen the taxes and it could be called a kind of protection.

Well, Sir, that, I think was climbing very vigorously on to our platform, and adopting the issue upon which we were standing, and forsaking the issue upon which hon. gentlemen opposite said they would go to the country. The "Star" of the same date gives this report of the same speech:

The speaker was in accord with his leader on the tariff question. The Liberal party was not seeking to make any radical change in the tariff, but simply wished for a readjustment of the duties on a more equitable basis—a tariff which would assist the manufacturers, and, at the same time would not press too heavily on the consumer.

That does not exactly square with the views expressed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). That desire to assist the manufacturers does not exactly square with the policy of removing every vestige of protection, to which the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), had committed himself. But I may remark that the hon. First Minister, who was present when Mr. Madore made this speech at Westmount, stated in the course of his address:

The issues now before the electors had been well defined by Mr. Madore.

So that this view of making no radical change in the tariff, but rather improving the condition of affairs in the country, was heartily endorsed by the hon. First Minister, who was there to ask the electors to accept the policy stated by Mr. Madore as the policy of the Liberal party.

Then, Sir, in Maisonneuve, the hon. First Minister supported Alderman Préfontaine. At that time Alderman Préfontaine delivered his views in the presence of the First Minister, who endorsed his candidature and asked the people to elect him. This is what Alderman Préfontaine said:

He (the speaker) was not a free trader, neither was the party; but he wished it understood that he was in favour of protection for the national industries. By protection he meant protection for all classes, not only for the manufacturing interests.

Now, Sir, I think 'have said enough—it is not necessary that I should detain the House longer—in regard to the point I have made, and that is, that on the great issue submitted to the electors of Canada on the 23rd of June, the hon. gentleman has received no mandate from the people, considering the extent to which he had qualified the views in regard to free trade and protection uttered on previous occasions by the two hon. gentlemen who sit now on his right and on his left.