

of it here. Now, does it not strike the hon. gentleman with a little astonishment that Free-trade England, with her dark horizon, with her deplorable condition every way, culminating with a famine in a large section of the Empire that is taxing the charities of the civilised world at this moment, and with a condition of pauperism and paralysis among the industrial classes of England itself, such as has hardly ever been paralleled in the history of that country, does it not strike the hon. gentleman, I say, with a little astonishment, that the only source of relief to which they are looking is the revival of trade and prosperity in one of the most highly protected countries in the world? The hon. gentleman has spoken of Lord Salisbury and Lord Derby. Does he not know that Lord Derby, when confronted with a body of workmen, told them the only resource he could recommend to them was to emigrate. Does the hon. gentleman not know that, when the sugar refiners went to Lord Salisbury, and asked him if there was no protection against the productive policy of France and other countries, if there was no security for the industries of their own country, that noble Lord answered them thus: "I do not see how we can bring any pressure to bear upon France or America, because we have nothing to offer them in return; we have given everything away already." That was the position of Canada yesterday, but it is altered to-day. Now we are in such a position that when the Hon. George Brown again is called upon to visit Washington for the purpose of negotiating a Reciprocity Treaty he will not be obliged to come back as he did before. He will not be in the same position as he was before, when he went down on his knees to get them to give a Reciprocity Treaty to Canada, and they asked him what he proposed to give them in return. Oh, he said, we have done all that long ago; we have given that all to you before; if you have any gratitude you ought to give some return. Oh, but, they said, that is not commercial principles; when we give anything away we want a *quid pro quo*. Consequently, that able man returned covered with the humiliation of defeat, because he was representative of a fiscal policy that enabled an American consul in this country to write to his Government: We have

got almost all the market of Canada; if you persist in shutting out the trade of Canada you will get it all. I say to the hon. gentlemen opposite that all that has been changed, that Canada now occupies a vantage ground in relation to this matter that she never occupied before. But, if they want evidences of an increase in trade, let them go to the great commercial centre of the country, Montreal. What does Mr. Robertson, Chairman of the Harbour Commissioners at Montreal, tell us? He says: We have increased the net revenue by \$400,000 more harbour dues this year. Trade has revived. What revived it? The increased importations of coal from the Maritime Provinces and of sugar from the West Indies. Yet those hon. gentlemen know how that bears upon the export trade in wheat by making the St. Lawrence the great outlet of cereals from the Western States. Our fiscal policy not only brought into operation the industry of sugar refining, but that gave employment to thousands of tons of shipping that otherwise would have plied between Boston and New York and the West Indies. Yet they close their eyes to the fact that it has given Canada back her West India trade, that Canadian ships manned by our own sailors are now carrying the products of our own country down to the West Indies, and coming back to Canadian ports, fostering the shipping industry, fostering the fisheries and fostering the lumber trade of the country. Yet, forgetting all that, the hon. gentleman closes his eyes to everything except the fact that it is called a Protective policy, and therefore it must be bad. I deny that the policy of my hon. friend has added one farthing to the cost of sugar in this country. I say that, notwithstanding the increased price of sugar here, the increase was still greater in New York. That fact alone shows how delusive the statement is. The hon. gentleman ventured to draw upon his imagination in regard to the poor man in St. John paying a duty on flour and coal. Does the hon. gentleman know that the duty on flour would not be 3c. per annum per head if it were distributed over the population of New Brunswick. It is the same in Nova Scotia. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the price of coal has been lowered in St. John instead of increased?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.