

Halifax I know there is a great deal of dissatisfaction with the protective policy, and a great many people there, and I may say all over Nova Scotia, are beginning to lose hope in the future of that Province. In Prince Edward Island I find that discontent exists there also. I notice in a newspaper that the Premier of Prince Edward Island, Mr. Sullivan, announced to-day he would move an address to Queen Victoria "representing the failure of the Canadian Government to carry out that part of the terms of Confederation which requires maintenance of the steam service for mails and passengers between Prince Edward Island and the main land, and praying the Queen to compel Canada to fulfil the terms of the union and compensate Prince Edward Island for non-fulfilment in the past." That takes in the whole three Maritime Provinces, in which it is evident there is a great deal of discontent. If there is discontent in those Provinces, the present Government is to blame for it. There was no discontent of any consequence prior to the introduction of this protective policy in 1879. The people, generally speaking, were contented, they had made up their minds to make the best of Confederation, and it is lamentable that to-day these Provinces should be clamoring for some change which none of us would desire to see brought about. I intend to refer shortly to the charges made against us by hon. gentlemen opposite, of attempting to make it appear that the country is not in a prosperous state. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) stated emphatically the other day that he defied any gentleman on this side to point out any statement coming from any responsible source, made by any responsible person, that the present Government had ever declared that they could make times good by Acts of Parliament. Well the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) read a portion of a speech made by Sir Charles Tupper in 1878, and the quotation is so apt, besides being short, that I think it will bear repetition. Sir Charles Tupper said:

"The hon. gentleman ought to know that if governments are good for anything they are good to increase the prosperity of the country by Acts of Parliament."

That is very positive and emphatic, and there can be no question as to its meaning, and ought to satisfy the member for King's, N.B., that he was not well informed on the subject. Gentlemen on the other side complain of us for saying that the people are leaving the country and that times are hard."

Well, I notice that in the debate on the Budget in 1878 the right hon. gentleman, now leader of the Government, used this language:

"It is not the tariff but the debt that makes the taxation."

Well, I think we have a debt now, and we must necessarily have taxation.

"If we incur a debt, the moment we incur it our obligations have to be carried out; and it matters not how this is done, we increase the debt *pro tanto*. It is the debt that makes the taxation, and the tariff only regulates the mode by which that debt can be defrayed. Hon. gentlemen opposite sneer at the statement that thousands of our people had left the country to seek employment in the United States."

Then again, in reply to Mr. Ross, who was then representing Middlesex, the right hon. gentleman said:

"He spoke also as if the depression could be denied. Who denies it? Is it denied in Ottawa; would any man who walks the streets in Ottawa deny the depression?"

Well, that is pretty strong. No doubt a good many men were at that time out of employ, but where are the men now who were engaged in the workshops then?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At work.

Mr. VAIL. If they are, it is in the United States, or somewhere else out of this country. They have all left since 1878. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought at least to hesitate before charging us with making use of language calculated to injure the country when we say there is great

depression in the country. They should have known that their high tariff could only benefit a few while the masses would be injured by it. I am now going to refer to a statement made by Sir A. T. Galt in 1876, in regard to the effect of protection upon a country, and as he is a well known authority, his remarks will, no doubt, receive attention:

"But if we are to succeed in getting immigrants to Canada we must not lose sight of the fact that it must be made attractive to them. It must be a cheap country. Immigrants must not find that it was dear as other countries which perhaps offer more advantages. That led to a consideration of the question of the high duties on imports. High rates had unquestionably made the United States a dear country, and Canada comparatively cheap, because of its moderate duties, which afford perhaps the most direct compensation for the natural advantages which the adjoining Republic possess over the Dominion. (Hear). He did not believe there was any advantage whatever in the doctrine of extreme protection. (Renewed applause). He did not believe it was possible to develop manufactures on any large scale by high duties. Our market is too limited, we have only four millions of people to supply, and it must be clear that the result of high duties would be to create an artificial industry which did not rest on its own intrinsic strength and merit. It was to be observed that protection (high duties) enhanced the cost of every other article as well as that in which a particular manufacturer might be interested. It rendered it more expensive for every manufacturer to manufacture his goods. If every thing the boot and shoe maker was protected by high duties, it was evident that his goods must be dearer. The result would be that exportation of our surplus goods to foreign countries would be impossible.

"We cannot have an export trade if the goods are artificially made dear in this country. We have in the United States a most complete example of that. There is a country which ought to be the cheapest country in the world, which has the largest amount of available land and every natural advantage, and yet by a wrong system of legislation and economic policy the people have succeeded for many years past in making it one of the dearest countries in the world instead of the cheapest."

That is the language of Sir Alexander Galt in 1876. I shall not refer to that matter further. I am now about to pass to some observations made by the junior member for Halifax, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place. However, it is not my fault, as I gave him notice before you, Sir, left the chair at 6 o'clock, that I intended to refer to his statements. Before doing so I would just refer to one remark made by the member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns). He said:

"Gentlemen opposite did not object to the bounty for fishermen. The only thing they found fault with was that the grant was only for one year, and they insisted that the grant should be perpetual."

I am very glad that acknowledgment came from the member from Gloucester. It was doubtless the intention of the Government to give the fishermen a bounty for one year only, and that happened to be the year before, or about the time the elections were to come off. They intended to confine it to that year, but, to the credit of the Opposition, they suggested that it should be made perpetual and passed into an Act. The Government accepted the suggestion, and therefore the fishermen have the Opposition to thank for the bounty being made perpetual. I may state here that the bounty is smaller than it ought to be. The least the Government could have given the fishermen was the interest on the money received from the American Government. They have not given them that, and the fishermen have a right to complain that, up to the present time, they have not received the full sum that they were fairly entitled to. The member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) in referring to what my hon. friend from Queen's Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), said in regard to the shipping interest, stated that when comparing the shipping of Great Britain with the shipping of the Maritime Provinces, he had, in the case of Great Britain, added the steamers to the sailing ships, and in the case of the Maritime Provinces, had left the steamers out and only counted the sailing ships. My hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I., states that that is not correct. The statement made and the calculation made by the hon. member for Queen's included both sailing ships and steamers in Great Britain, and the sailing ships and steamers in the Dominion.