

success and that the party finding that it did not appear to be the road to power, felt it necessary that that policy should receive its quietus, and the funeral obsequies were performed by the hon. member for Queen's, who went down to Middletown, in the county of Annapolis, N.S., in 1893, for that purpose. In a speech delivered there the hon. gentleman said :

Well, gentlemen, I need say no more. Whatever doubts or difficulties there may have been about understanding our trade policy in times past, there is none now. Our platform is clear and definite. \* \* \* To-day the people of Canada stand face to face with such an issue, and the next contest is to be one between free trade and protection. \* \* \* The policy of the Liberal party, on the contrary, is the reform of the tariff by the elimination from it of every vestige of protection.

There can be nothing more clear and definite than the frank statement which the hon. gentleman made as to the policy of the great party to which he belonged. Then at Sussex, N.B., on January 4, 1896, a very recent date, that hon. gentleman, who is the leader of the party in the maritime provinces and a very able leader, gave expression to the following sentiments :—

A 17 or 20 per cent tariff was high enough to give encouragement to any manufacturer; if it were not, the manufacturers should go down.

No intelligent elector could obtain from that statement any opinion except that it was the determination of the Liberal party, if they came into power, to give a tariff of 17 per cent or at the outside 20 per cent, and if manufacturers could not live under it they must die. In 1891 the leader of the Government in May of that year, as will be seen by reference to page 27 of "Hansard," still clung with a good deal of longing, notwithstanding the defeat of the party at the polls, to unrestricted reciprocity, and he used the following language :—

While they commit the mistake of basing their trade policy, uniformity of allegiance and a mere sentiment, we of the Liberal party maintain that the policy of this country must be based not upon sentiment but upon business principles; and, fresh as we come from the people, I say that the only policy which will benefit this country is unrestricted reciprocity and continental freedom of trade. Sir Charles Tupper says in an article published a few days ago in the "North American Review," that the delusion, as he calls it, of unrestricted reciprocity was dead and buried. Dead and buried! I am as good an authority on the subject as is Sir Charles Tupper, and I say that it is more alive than ever.

Well, the hon. gentleman changed his opinion upon that subject at a later period, and he found that the statement which I have ventured to make, that unrestricted reciprocity was dead and buried, proved to be true. And if any doubt remained, the funeral obsequies of that ill-fated bantling, per-

formed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) for ever set at rest the question as to what the fate of unrestricted reciprocity had ever been. The hon. the First Minister, however, revised his view in reference to that, and he returned to his first love free trade. He said not very long ago :

The Liberal party believe in free trade on broad lines, such as exists in Great Britain; and upon that platform, exemplified as I have told you, the Liberal party will fight its next battle.

That was a tolerably conclusive statement as to what the views of the First Minister were as to the issue between the two great parties at the recent election. Then, as late as the 22nd of January, 1896, the hon. the First Minister said :

I have read in the "Gazette" the statement that if you remove protection, raw material would no longer be free. I say that if we were to have a revenue tariff, raw material would be free. Raw materials are not free to-day under the protective system. There are certain raw materials which are free. Wool is free; thank heaven they have not thought of taxing it. Cotton is free, also, but is iron free? Cotton is a raw material, and wool is a raw material for certain manufactures, but there are two articles which are raw material of every manufacturer, and these articles are coal and iron, and are they free? If you have a revenue tariff, the object will be to develop the country, and all raw material should be free under such a tariff.

No statement could be clearer, no statement could be stronger than that as to the determination of the hon. gentlemen—and this, mark you, is down to a comparatively short period before the battle was fought—that the duty on coal and iron should be removed. Again, at Sohmer Park, on the 18th February, 1896, the hon. gentleman said :

They have a tax on iron, which is a raw material of every industry. The tax on iron is \$4 a ton, and at the present price of iron, that means a tax of 63 per cent ad valorem. The tax on coal, which is also a raw material of every industry is 60 cents a ton. Although I have not the latest quotations of coal, I am sure that this tax is equivalent to 40 per cent. There is a tax on coal oil of six cents a gallon, which, considering the price of coal oil in the United States, is equivalent to a tax of 100 per cent, to which must be added the tax of 40 cents on the barrels containing the oil. Can the industries which are thus taxed for the raw materials they use produce advantageously? You have piano factories in Montreal; the duties on imported pianos is 25 per cent. Can the piano manufacturer support foreign competition when he is taxed to the extent of 40, 60 and 100 per cent on the raw materials that he uses, and only gets a protection of 25 per cent on his manufactured products? The same is true of your wagon factories; it is true of the mass of industries. Protection is a fine thing only for a few monopolies. It mars the growth of all our great national industries. Now, I have been asked, what are you going to do? I have just told you what we are going to do. We are going to have a tariff for revenue, and we are going to abolish completely all the duties on raw materials.