

Dymond) happened to differ and who had differed for the moment from his leaders. He rejoiced to know that circumstances and time had, to a large extent, brought them nearer together in that respect; and he rejoiced still more to know that neither in the press of the party to which he had the honour to belong, nor yet on the floor of that House, nor in any public utterance of opinion of the leading members of that party, had a single word been said which would cast reproach upon any hon. gentleman for exercising, under circumstances which he doubted not were more or less at times painful to themselves, the privilege that belonged to them and the right they were entitled to claim of holding their own views upon this particular question. Having said this much, he proposed to notice as he had said just now, what had been the policy of the party opposite in relation to this particular issue. When hon. gentlemen came before them and asked them to reinstate them in power, and when they claimed to be reinstated on certain grounds, it was obviously their duty to ask whether their past conduct, not simply their speeches, not simply their promises, and not simply their pledges, but whether their past acts and conduct entitled them to confidence at their hands; and he thought he should be able to show that, although there might be hon. gentlemen in the House who would have the right to claim their confidence as Protectionists, these hon. gentlemen were not to be found in the ranks of the present Opposition; that it was not to the leaders of that party, and that it was not to their most influential followers that they were to look for such a proof of their past career having been consistent with their present professions as would entitle them to place any confidence in them (the Opposition) even though they were reinstated, and though they did promise that a certain policy would be carried out. It was necessary, in reviewing what he would call the tariff history of the country during the past few years, to go back as far as the tariff of Sir Alexander Galt in the year 1859. He had no doubt that there were gentlemen within the sound of his voice who

had a somewhat painful recollection, even at this day, of the state of the finances when Sir Alexander Galt assumed the position of Finance Minister. They would remember it was in a period of financial confusion, when deficits had taken the place of surpluses and when a crisis of terrible financial distress had occurred, that Sir Alexander Galt was called upon to assume the position to which he was appointed in order that a superior mind might bring something like order out of chaos; and, although it was quite true that Sir Alexander Galt's tariff was, in a certain sense, protective, it was not protective to the extent or in the sense that the tariff submitted to them by the right hon. gentleman, so far as they could understand it, would be a protective tariff. For instance, the Reciprocity Treaty then being in force, there were no duties upon the products of the farm, upon animals, or upon coal, or upon salt. On goods in the unenumerated list, forming a very large portion of our manufactured articles, the duty was fixed at 20 per cent. while the duty on the manufactures, of leather and cloth was 25 per cent.; and this was what was often spoken of as the protective tariff of 1859. But in 1866 it became necessary to revise that tariff, and then they had a new policy and an entire change of policy enunciated. In 1866, hon. gentlemen opposite, then being the party in power, reduced the tariff from 20 or 25 per cent. on the unenumerated list to 15 per cent., and on sole and upper leather, which had formerly come in under a 25 per cent. tariff, the duty was reduced to 10 per cent. They imposed other duties on farm produce—on wheat flour 50c. per barrel, on other meal 25c.; on Indian corn and other grains 10c. per bushel; and on meats 1c. a pound, while wheat and coal and salt were admitted free. It would be obvious, therefore, that, with this tariff, although small duties were imposed on some products of the farm, it was in no sense a Protectionist tariff, as compared with the tariff foreshadowed by the right hon. gentleman. He called the attention of the House also to the fact, in view of recent speeches from hon. gentlemen oppo-