

coal, they could very well afford to pay it, considering the position in which they are placed to-day under the National Policy, compared with that in which they were placed before. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to carry his attention back to the occasion on which he introduced his first Budget Speech. What was the prospect he held out then with reference to the Intercolonial Railway? He led the House to believe that they might be prepared for a deficit of \$1,250,000 in the working of that railway. Well, the year that they retired from the management of public affairs, the deficit went up to nearly \$750,000, and, had the hon. gentleman remained long enough in power, I think he would have been able to prove himself a correct prophet by running the deficit up to the amount he estimated, \$1,250,000. To-day, however, we are able to say that we have increased the carriage of freight 42 per cent., and instead of having to face a deficit of \$750,000, as the account stood in 1878-79, when the policy of the hon. gentleman opposite was changed, we had a small balance it is true, but a balance on the right side of the books. The hon. gentleman may say that we increased freight 42 per cent. So we did, but what effect would that have had if they remained in power? If it had cost as much to carry a ton of freight as when they were in power, the deficits would have enormously increased, and the hon. gentleman would have been able to show triumphantly how accurate he made his estimate when he estimated that it would reach \$1,250,000. Turn which way you like, and what do you find? You find, just as the railroad barometer shows, an enormous increase of traffic, progress, prosperity and comfort, taking the place of poverty and retrogression. That is what you find all over this country. My hon. friend the Finance Minister had the proud satisfaction of standing here, the other night, and presenting a picture of the condition of this country, such as might well fill with just pride the breast of every patriotic Canadian. It did not seem to have quite that effect upon some hon. gentlemen who are not a hundred miles away. One would have supposed he was unfolding a record of the most disastrous woe that could befall a country, if one were to judge from the lengthened visage of the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance. Perhaps no man ever suffered more than he, while it was his painful duty to see the hon. Finance Minister place in bold relief, though without any allusion to it, the successful results of his policy in contradistinction to the failure of the policy of the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance. I need not remind you of the fact that when we adopted our policy, when the issue was joined, when the question was practically for this country whether we should have direct taxation or adopt the National Policy of protecting Canadian industries on Canadian soil. The hon. gentleman smiles when I refer to direct taxation. Does he forget that he himself stood here and admitted that he was at the end of his tether, that all his resources were exhausted, that he knew of no means of wringing any more taxation out of the impoverished people of this country except by direct taxation?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No; I did not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman forgets that when a number of the members from Lower Canada were urging a policy that would favor the growth of Canadian tobacco, he met that proposition, not by saying that it was a bad one, but by saying that it would take \$500,000 out of the revenue, and that he knew no mode of replacing it except by direct taxation. The hon. gentleman referred the other night to memories. There is no one thing that he has so much reason to dread as the memory of the members of this House. His Budget Speeches have been fyled away, and have become musty, because no person wishes to turn up such unprofitable and unwholesome reading. If he could only wipe out the recollection of those speeches, and the positions

that he assumed when he was feebly attempting to grapple with what he was unable to deal with—the financial interests of this country—it would be, indeed, a fortunate thing for him. We can well recollect when the hon. gentleman brought down his Tariff in 1874 and imposed \$3,000,000 additional taxes, and came back two years later with another deficit, and asked for an additional \$500,000 taxes, he told us we had reached the limit of indirect taxation, and that if he had any convenient mode of collecting an income tax he would be disposed to propound it. I say that, when the right hon. the leader of the Government came to the rescue, when the people themselves came to the rescue and saved the country from the incompetent hands of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, we stood on the threshold of direct taxation; and if we have it not now it is because these hon. gentlemen were deprived of the position for which they had shown their utter unfitness. But what did they say when our policy was adopted, when we compelled them to admit that we had fairly and faithfully redeemed the pledges on which we had been elected, that we had carried out manfully the assurances we had given the people? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the memories of hon. members of this House have enabled them to forget that the ground he took was that it would fail as a revenue Tariff?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. So it was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman forget that he took the ground, on the floor of this Parliament, that the depression would be intensified instead of decreased? Does he forget that for six long months, he and all his followers, in and out of this House, and the *Globe* newspaper, endeavored to show that the depression was deepening, and that the country was irretrievably ruined; and it was only when right and left, before and behind, everywhere in fact, evidence presented itself so overwhelming of the progress and prosperity of the country that it could be no longer concealed, that the hon. gentlemen harked back on their prophecies and tried to discover something besides the National Policy to which our great progress might be attributed? But, Sir, that door is not open to them. It was closed by themselves. Here, on the floor of Parliament, when discussing this great issue of the fiscal policy of Canada, they declared the adoption of the policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would fail as a source of revenue, because it would so tax the imports coming into this country that no one could import anything. We tried, in our feeble way, to convince them that they were wrong. We tried to show them that, if we fostered and protected the interests of Canada as they should be, the purchasing power of the people would be increased, and that the imports would increase in a corresponding ratio. Hon. gentlemen had other objections. What were they? They said: "The credit of the country is gone; your policy is such an attack upon Imperial interests that it will close the money market of the world, and your loss of revenue will deprive you still further of the means of paying the indebtedness of the country." That was the hon. gentleman's ground. Where do we stand to-day? When my hon. friend was able to stand up and tell us the revenue had shown such buoyancy, and reached the position it had never shown before, did my hon. friend attempt to show that the credit of the country had suffered? Why, Sir, let me invite the hon. ex-Minister's attention for a few moments to the figures that I have here. If he has any doubt about the credit of the country, they will set his doubts at rest at once and for ever. What did he do when he was entrusted with the power of negotiating the bonds of Canada in the money markets of the world—before he required any money—the hon. gentleman rushed with hot haste into the money market, and by a process to which we shall perhaps refer more at length by-and-by, put the securities of Canada