

the basis of tariff alone. If English goods come to a certain percentage compared with German goods, then they are to be admitted; otherwise we are discriminating against different nations. The same set of conditions must entitle every nation to come in otherwise we are discriminating between countries. These conditions must be absolutely fixed and not contingent on advantage to be derived by Canada. The power given is an extraordinary one. There is no power more jealously guarded by the people of a country than the treaty-making power. Take for example the United States to the south of us. They have never placed in the hands of the President the treaty power, but it rests in the hands of men elected by the people directly and indirectly. In Great Britain the same principle applies. What is the case here? We are asked to place in the hands of the Controller of Customs and he alone, subject of course to the approval of the Governor General in Council, a power that may bring this Dominion, yes, in fact, the mother country and the Empire into serious conflict with other nations. Every one is aware how jealous nations are in regard to trade. In fact nine-tenths of the wars have arisen out of trade disputes or trade demands. Nevertheless it is proposed to give the Government powers which foolishly or stubbornly exercised may result in peace or war, powers which it is absurd to place in the hands of any man or any set of men. England cannot for one moment endorse such a proposal.

Turning to the matter of the tariff I will say this, that I in common with many hon. members on this side of the House rather feel like congratulating ourselves, that after eighteen years of attack and denunciation, these people who have been attacking and denouncing the Conservatives and their policy, tried to get as near as they could to it, and at the same time to give some pretext to the country for the claim that they have departed from it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So near and yet so far.

Mr. POWELL. So near and not so far. Under the Conservative administration and the beneficial results of the National Policy, this country, during eighteen years sprang forward by leaps and bounds, and made progress unparalleled in the commercial history of any country in the world, if we except England's development for the decade following the adoption of free trade.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Particularly in the population of New Brunswick.

Mr. POWELL. That matter has been threshed out time and again. The method of taking the last census failed to reveal increases to the population where the most reliable statistics showed large increases. Both the Minister of Railways and the Min-

ister of Marine and Fisheries know the truth of what I am going to state as an illustration. Take the census of 1881, and the census of 1891, and compare them in respect to the parish in which I live, the parish of Sackville. Any man who knows, will tell you that this parish has made greater progress during that decade, than probably any other portion of New Brunswick. It has increased in wealth and increased in population. In the lower portion of that rich and populous parish, there are to-day two houses and more, for every house there when the National Policy was introduced in 1879. Notwithstanding this the census of 1891 shows only a very trifling increase over the census of 1881. There is something wrong on the face of the census returns, and what is wrong has been explained over and over again to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He knows it, but he has the figures of the census before him and persists in his unfair course. He is at liberty to make whatever he can out of this cheap device.

Now, if this trade policy of the Conservative party was a bad thing, if it was decimating the population of our country, why was it not immediately wiped out of existence when the Liberals came into power? If protection is a poison, why was not the antidote at once applied? The Liberal Government is holding to the Conservative policy to-day, because they know that it was the greatest stimulant that was ever applied to the trade of this or any other country. During the last campaign the Minister of Marine (Mr. Davies) had two or three stock arguments. One of these was, that it was greatly in the interests of the country and the maritime provinces especially, that they should have free coal oil. From one end of Prince Edward Island to the other, he tried to lead the farmers to believe, that under a Liberal Government all duty would be wiped out and coal oil would be so much cheaper than daylight, that the people would put up the shutters on their windows and burn it even in daytime. But, what has the Liberal Government done with regard to the duty on coal oil? They have reduced the duty by a paltry cent a gallon. The Minister of Marine also told the people that he was going to do away with the iniquitous duty on flour; a duty which the Prime Minister declared to be imposed—he even said “corruptly” imposed—in the interests of the farmers of Ontario, in order to buy their votes; and which he further declared was a tax that should be immediately wiped off the Statute-book, and should not be incorporated in the tariff of any civilized nation except under the extreme financial exigencies of war. But the Liberal Government is in power, and still the duty on flour substantially remains. Is this near to it and yet so far? I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to take up the time of the House