

Mr. MACKENZIE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear; but I would like to ask him if there is no significance in such a result as was recently witnessed in the great constituency of the North Riding of Yorkshire—

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; there is not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Where this question was made a battle ground of party, and where one of the most important and influential constituencies in the Empire reversed its verdict and pronounced unequivocally in favor of a policy of Protection, even to the extent of a duty on corn? Well, Sir, as I said before, if I were quite prepared to admit that the policy of Free Trade was the best to be adopted in the British Empire and by Great Britain, I should, at the same time, maintain that, situated as Canada is, we have no alternative but to adopt the policy now in force in this country. It is impossible, Sir, and any one must admit it who takes the trouble to look at the position Canada occupies, with a comparatively small population of between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 of people, and lying alongside the great country to the south of us, now numbering 50,000,000; it is impossible, Sir, I say, for any public man to examine this question and arrive at any other conclusion than that the policy of Canada must be greatly influenced by the fiscal policy of the great country to the south of us. And, Sir, I think it would be wise to adopt the sentiment of Carlyle, that history is philosophy, teaching by experience, and, looking at the question in the light of that important axiom, ask ourselves what the result of fourteen years experience in relation to this question has been for Canada, what inference has been drawn from the policy of the two great parties in this country by the experience gained in relation to these questions for the last fifteen years? It is well known, Sir, that the party who now have the confidence of the people of this country adopted, from the first, a policy of protecting Canadian industries.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. An hon. member on the other side of the House questions that statement; but, Sir, I think I shall be able to show that hon. gentleman that the low Tariff of 1867, adopted by the party now in power, was as protective a policy as was required in the interests of Canada in that day. Hon. gentlemen may say that the Tariff of Canada had been reduced in 1866. Why reduced? Because the reduced Tariff of 1866, adopted before Confederation, was a Tariff found to be all that was necessary in order to give the protection required for Canadian industries. It is well known, Sir, that the great war, which existed from 1861 to 1865, in the United States, so completely disorganized the labor markets of that country as to afford for many subsequent years quite as full and as abundant a protection to Canadian industries as under the present Tariff. The hon. gentleman knows right well that, although a low Tariff was adopted at the first Session of the first Parliament of this Dominion, the policy was then adopted of fostering and protecting Canadian industries. Hon. gentlemen know right well that, although a low Tariff was adopted, it was accompanied by measures calculated to foster these industries. Look at the free list, and you will find that the policy was to provide for the introduction of articles required to be consumed and to be used in manufacturing industries to a much larger extent than was subsequently the case. Then taking the great interest, especially the shipbuilding, and the policy was adopted of fostering that great and important industry by making articles that entered into the construction of shipping and that had to be imported into this country free of duty. Then the industry of sailing these ships that were built was also fostered by adopting a policy of making the light dues

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

which rested on the vessel a Government charge. So with regard to all other industries, every effort was made to give such protection as industries of the country at that period required. Take the question of machinery. At that time it is well known that within Canada you could obtain but a very small amount of machinery, owing to the absence of any manufactory of machinery. The policy of the first Parliament, and of the first Tariff that was enacted in this Dominion, was a policy of allowing all machinery that could not be manufactured in the country to be admitted free of duty for the purpose of fostering the establishment of new industries within the borders of Canada. Then, Sir, we had the question of the fisheries, one of the largest and most important industries in this country. What was done for this industry? In the first instance, every person knows that, with the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, the market which had been open to our fishermen had been closed. What did we do? The Government of Canada decided to foster and protect our own fishermen, and to prevent encroachment upon our fishing grounds by fishermen from the United States, and this gave all the advantage to our fishermen that they could receive. Every person remembers the taunts and ridicule that were thrown from the other side of the House at our efforts in that respect. Every person remembers the taunts with reference to Mr. Mitchell's fleet used for the purpose of protecting that industry. Not only did we do that, but we imposed a tonnage license upon American fishermen coming into our waters, and when a license of 50 cents a ton was found not to be adequate protection we raised it to \$2. Having thus shown a firm resolve to protect the undoubted rights of our fishermen in our waters the United States were brought to the conclusion that it was desirable to have that question arranged by a treaty; and it is well known, Sir, that the result of the Washington Treaty was not only to re-open the American markets to the fishermen of this country—under the policy of Protection we had adopted—but it was agreed, under that Treaty, that means should be taken to ascertain what amount of money should be paid by the United States Government to Canada for the enjoyment of our fisheries. Every person who was present in this House at the time remembers the taunts and sneers flung across the floor of the House by hon. gentlemen opposite in relation to that matter, and we were told that nothing would be obtained. But, Sir, as an outcome of that Washington Treaty, and of the efforts of hon. gentlemen then and now on this side of the House to protect the interests of our fishermen, no less a sum than \$4,500,000 was awarded to be paid to this country; and, to-day, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, true to the policy of protecting that great and important Canadian industry, is in a position to come down and ask justly from this House that no less than \$150,000 per annum shall be contributed by this Parliament from the public funds as a bounty to the fishermen, whose fishing grounds have been, to a certain extent surrendered, under the Washington Treaty, to the fishermen of another country. I mention this in order to show that the policy which animates gentlemen on this side of the House is a policy that was adopted in 1867, on the first formation of the Canadian Government, and has continued until the present time. Well, Sir, it will also be remembered by gentlemen opposite that we made a very strong endeavor to secure protection for the great coal mining interests of this country and for the great agricultural industry. It will be remembered that the Government of that day—the first of this Confederation—brought down a policy imposing a duty upon coal coming from the United States into this country, and accompanied it by a proposition to impose a duty upon grain and breadstuffs brought from the adjoining Republic into Canada. It will be remembered that, notwithstanding that that policy was maintained for a year, we were obliged ultimately to succumb to the