

principles, St. John will be hailed as the free trade centre of the country.

In this Prince Edward Island "Primer," which was given out by the faithful for the conversion of that tight little island, what did they say :

The Liberal policy is to so adjust the customs tariff that all the taxes paid through it shall go into the Treasury, and not into the coffers of a few favoured industries.

Where is my hon. friend to-day with his rice protected? Now, I touch a sore point in the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), with his sugar protected, with his 35 per cent upon hundreds of articles, with his tariff raised from 5 to 10 and sometimes 15 per cent over the old tariff. Where is my hon. friend's argument? Does he not feel a twinge of conscience that he ever edited a production of that kind and sent it out to the people of Prince Edward Island, and then so soon go back on the policy he there announced :

The Liberals further say, that while all citizens, according to their means, should be taxed for the support of the national Government, to tax them for the support of private enterprises, and under cover to take money from one citizen's purse to enrich another, is a gross injustice and legalized robbery.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend and his Government perpetuate that gross injustice and robbery by the very tariff they ask this Parliament to assent to to-day. I do not know whether I ought to or not read the part in this "Primer" which refers to coal oil—kerosene oil—which used to be a pet subject of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is in his St. John speech, it is in every speech made on every platform, everybody who has heard him knows of the coal oil outrage and robbery. Why, he calculated the percentages. He put them in at 125 to 145 per cent. Coal oil—yes; when we were in power, we reduced it 11-5 cents. My hon. friends struggled awfully and reduced it 1 cent.

But I have better evidence than that. I have what is the most formal pledge a party can make—a resolution which, when in Opposition, they submitted to the House. In 1894, anticipating an election, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved this resolution :

That while recognizing in the reductions proposed an admission, to that extent, of the evils inflicted upon the people by the system of high protective duties, this House is, nevertheless, of the opinion that the amendments suggested, being based upon the principle of protection and not solely upon the requirements of the public service, are inadequate to afford satisfactory relief from the burdens of excessive and unfair taxation :

That the highest interests of Canada demand the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will pro-

mote domestic and foreign trade and hasten the return of prosperity to our people ;

Here follows the point :

That, to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government ;—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Be ready now :

—should have eliminated from it the principle of protection to particular industries at the expense of the community at large, and should be imposed for revenue only.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says that is good gospel, and my hon. friend voted for it then, and in his heart believed in it and believes in it to-day. Will he have the courage, when the vote is called on this tariff, to stand up and pour out his heart or will he truckle to political exigencies? Will he blindly follow the leaders who are betraying the party faith in this matter of protection?

That it should be adjusted so as to make free, or bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessities of life, and to promote freer trade with the whole world, and particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friends are eclectics. They belong to that peculiar school that when they subscribe to an article of faith which has five clauses, they satisfy their consciences if they keep one clause and drop or break all the others. I do not know but that I ought now to read a statement by the leader at the convention when they were arranging their platform, which statement is published in a brochure issued for campaign purposes. It is quoted from Hon. Wilfrid Laurier's convention speech :

There is taken out of the people of Canada over \$20,000,000 every year in customs taxes. If every cent collected through the operation of the protective policy went into the Treasury, it could be borne, but for every one dollar that goes into the public coffers, two dollars or three dollars go into the pockets of the protected manufacturers. I, said Mr. Laurier, object to this. I say that not a cent should be collected beyond what is required to meet the country's necessities. We will tax for revenue, but not one cent for protection. Taxation is an evil that nothing but the requirements of the Government can justify. When we are in power—and I don't want to sell the skin of the bear until the bear is shot; yet I think the Tory bear is about to be skinned—we will free the people from protection, which is a fraud, a delusion and a robbery. For it is robbery to take money from one man and give it to another.

There can be nothing stronger than that in the English language, and having read that, it is not necessary for me to read more.

Now, Sir, these were the pledges of the Liberal party up to and down to the elections of June, 1896. Then, what do we find?