

MR. OLIVER said that he could give the reason why he had then made this speech. It was now eight years ago, and in the course of this period any person ought to gain experience, and by strictly studying the trade of this country he ought to know more about it in 1878 than in 1870. It was well known that at that time there was a meeting of Canadian manufacturers, who then, as now, wanted heavier protective duties placed on manufactured good; and they published a large number of copies of the headings of a petition which was circulated throughout the length and breadth of the country. These petitions were sent to every municipal Council in the country, and to every particular locality to get signatures attached and to be presented to this House. The municipal Councils, without discussing them much, signed them and sent them down to Parliament, and he had then the honour of presenting to the House a very large number of petitions asking for the policy which he at that time advocated; and he must admit that without taking the matter so fully into consideration as he ought to have done, he had pursued the course mentioned by the hon. gentleman. But what was the experience of the twelve months during which that duty was levied on these goods? Was it an experience which confirmed him in the opinion that this policy was the correct one? He held that the experience which he and the people which he represented had during that period, was anything but one which gave satisfaction to the promoters of that policy. There was not a single manufacturer in his county that used coal as a raw material, but what found fault with the duty on coal; not a single individual in his county but that found fault with the extra duty on salt, and he had not met a single individual, throughout the length and breadth of the country, who did not similarly condemn this policy which was pursued in this regard by the Government of the day in 1870; and if he had the journals of the House before him, he thought he could show that the hon. member for Cumberland was just as inconsistent as he was, and not so honest in confessing his inconsistency. The

MR. OLIVER;

hon. gentleman voted for that policy, and he did all he could, not being a member of the Government at the time, to compel the Government to bring in this policy. They all remembered the change of policy that was made within a very few hours, and they knew very well that the pressure which the hon. gentleman brought to bear on the Government caused it; also, that 10 or 11 months afterwards, this hon. gentleman voted for the repeal of this policy, and of the act which imposed this duty. And yet the hon. gentleman had the assurance to accuse, in this House, any hon. gentleman of inconsistency, though he was as inconsistent in this regard as any gentleman on the floor of Parliament. And were they to trace the political career of the hon. gentleman from the time he entered public life, he did not doubt that hon. gentleman's inconsistency could be shown in a great many other cases. The hon. gentleman was inconsistent with reference to this very motion; he and the right hon. member for Kingston declared in the House a few days ago that the policy of the Opposition was to allow raw material to come into this country free of duty. Was coal raw material for manufacturing purposes? It was either this or manufactured goods, and no manufacturing institution in this country could be carried on without coal. Then it was a raw material; and yet the hon. gentleman advocated the imposition of a duty on it, and would thereby impose a duty on the raw material which he had said should enter the country free of duty. This was inconsistent. The hon. gentleman also said that the imposition of a small duty had caused a very great quantity of goods to be sent from Canada to the Maritime Provinces. The flour consumed in the Lower Provinces was the product of the Canadian farmer, and was it the levying of a duty that caused it to be sent there? There was no duty on flour now, and this had not been the case for the last seven years; but, nevertheless, the flour consumed in the Maritime Provinces principally came from Canada, which afforded proof positive that it was not the imposition of a duty which caused articles of trade to flow into Nova Scotia and the