

*Globe* newspaper, they will find that I attacked the hon. gentleman's Tariff on that occasion on the ground that it took away the protection—the fostering protection—which was given by the Tariff that had previously existed, to Canadian industries. Hon. gentlemen will discover that on that occasion I joined issue with the ex-Minister of Finance on the question of the proposed imports on shipbuilding, and I said: "Here is a great Canadian industry. It is in a position that will not bear tampering with, and yet I find that one of your first moves is to take away the protection which this industry has enjoyed, owing to the freedom from duty upon articles which go into the construction of ships, and are imported into this country." And I was able to fight the battle so sharply on that occasion, with the aid of my friends on this side of the House, that we compelled the hon. gentleman to take back his Tariff, readjust it, and make it much less obnoxious than it was before. I told the hon. gentleman in that debate—as will be found in the report to which I refer—that he was attacking the industries of Canada by imposing a duty on machinery which was brought into this country, and this, too, when there was no corresponding aid given to the manufacturers, who were to bring such machinery into this country, so that, from the beginning to the end, Sir, I took the ground that that hon. gentleman was striking a fatal blow at Canadian industries in his Tariff, and defended the policy of fostering the industries of Canada as far as it was in my power to do so on that occasion. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman was successful, and what was his first move? The leader of the Opposition at Cobourg said that what they proposed to do was to foster industries by taking the duties off all articles which went into manufacturing, and by increasing the free list. But what did the Government of which the hon. gentleman and the ex-Minister of Finance were members do when they had the power? Did they promote the industries of Canada by taking the duties off articles such as I have mentioned, and by enlarging the free list? No, Sir, but they struck a heavy blow at the industries of Canada by imposing duties on a large number of articles which entered into the consumption of manufactures in this country, taking them out of the free list and imposing duties on them. Then, Sir, I need not say that another step of these hon. gentlemen in the same direction was the reimposition of the duties on tea and coffee. These hon. gentlemen now profess—as hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are very apt to profess when they have not any power to deal with the subject—a deep anxiety for the poor man; but who does not remember, when they brought down a measure to levy duties on tea and coffee, that they banded themselves together to a man and voted down the resolution which was proposed by my hon. friend, who then and now represents Montreal, with the view of having these duties so adjusted as to lighten the tax on the poor man. Under their Tariff the rich man, who is able to drink tea that costs 90 cents or \$1 a pound, had to pay no larger tax into the revenue, and had to contribute no more to the revenue, than did the poor man, who was only able to drink tea worth 25 cents a pound. These gentlemen were then deaf to the claims and difficulties of the poor man, and without compunction voted down the resolution that would have modified the unfairness of the Tariff, which was putting a heavy duty on tea and coffee. Well, Sir, they then imposed taxes on articles which were in the free list, and they burthened the industries of the country with exactions; and at the very time when all was changed, and when all was changing, these hon. gentlemen imposed duties on the shipbuilding industry, and they imposed duties on the great bulk of our industrial community by the levying of a tax on tea and coffee, and struck off the protection which had existed with reference to Canadian trade in tea, by removing the differential duty which had hitherto

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

enabled this trade to be carried on in Canada. Everything that these hon. gentlemen could do to make Boston and New York the commercial capitals of Canada they did do, and with what result? With the result, as I have said before, that during the five years that these hon. gentlemen were in power, and that this policy of taking away the protection which had been given by their predecessors to Canadian industries prevailed, of making the poor man poorer, and of bringing this country into a condition such as every Canadian, of whatever stripe of politics he might be, earnestly deplored, and such as every patriotic Canadian can never wish again to see in this country. I defended the duty upon coal when we were in power in the first instance. We maintained that principle as long as we could; and when we returned to power we reverted to our original policy—the same policy of fostering Canadian industries that had animated us from the first. We returned to it, and publicly proclaimed, as we did years before, that it was a proper principle, when we urged upon them the vital importance, in the interest of the country, of changing that policy in this respect. We did all that men could who were in a minority to induce them to adopt a policy which we believed would be successful in changing the financial condition of the country. I had pointed out repeatedly the experience of that great nation to the south of us, which had adopted the policy of protection to foster the industries of the country, with the result of relieving it from the disastrous consequences of its great Civil War. I talked, however, to deaf ears. But, having received the mandate of the people to deal with the great question of the financial policy of the country—having declared, with no uncertain sound, what the policy was which animated us, and would inspire us if again entrusted with power, the result of our appeal to the country was to sustain the policy we had adopted here, and which we had pledged ourselves to carry out if once more entrusted with power. Well, we reimposed the duty on coal—that odious tax which hon. gentlemen opposite had succeeded in striking down, but which I have shown here is a pure question of revenue, and which can be defended on that ground as successfully as any question that can be discussed. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, dealt with this subject, and that is perhaps the only part of his speech with which I was inclined to differ—he stated that one-half the duty on coal was paid in the United States. On the other hand, the ex-Finance Minister, the other day, quoted from a speech of my colleague, the Speaker of the Senate, in reference to the imposition of the duty on coal; and I am quite aware that, years ago, that hon. gentleman and a number of other hon. gentlemen associated with the Conservative party were not so advanced as they are to-day in regard to this subject. I am glad, however, that the hon. gentleman opposite has quoted a part of the argument which he deemed conclusive in reference to this public question. By-and-bye, however, I shall invite him to pay the same respect to the views of the Speaker of the Senate on another point which will come under consideration, which he has shown in relation to this question. Now, when I was down in Picton, I made a speech to which the hon. gentleman opposite did me the honor of alluding. He said I stated I had placed a duty on coal which fell mainly upon 1,500,000 people of Ontario. My opponent questioned the right to have a sectional tax, but I pointed to the fact that the ex-Finance Minister had set an example of supporting and sustaining a sectional tax. I pointed to the fact that that hon. gentleman had placed a duty on petroleum of 150 per cent. on an article that was solely the product of Ontario, and which was largely paid by the other Provinces. Then again, duties were placed on the 100,000 tons of shipping in the Maritime Provinces, that would have produced \$100,000 under the Tariff which the hon. gentleman brought down.