

the policy ended on the 31st day of January. What was the answer? What does the House suppose the increase amounts to, as the result of this magnificent policy that was going to secure for us the trade of England as a grateful response? Why, Sir, it amounts to 1 per cent for the six months. Some papers have got the statement that it is 6 per cent, which is an entire delusion. Mr. Chamberlain said: If you include July, which you cannot include, because it is outside of the question altogether, and before the preferential rate came into operation, it would be 6 per cent, but for the first months it was 1 per cent. And this is the policy on which the hon. gentleman prides himself.

But now, Sir, I intend to give an evidence from the Treasury benches with regard to this question upon whose policy the present great prosperity of this country depends. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), at Perth last month, had occasion to make a very important speech, and a very important speech it was. He said:

The tariff was a question that was settled, and was now a dead issue.

No more talk in this House about a tariff; we are done with that, he said. What more does he say?

Because the Liberals had succeeded in solving this great question, and the tariff was one their opponents, if they got a chance, would not change much.

Why would they not change it? Because it is their tariff. The hon. gentleman may say, and there is something in that. But suppose we had carried out our pledges, where would the prosperity have been? I agree with him; it would have been non-existent, and it was because they knew that they had either been deceiving and misleading the people of this country for eighteen long years, or having grown older, they had, as may be charitably supposed, grown wiser, and had come to the conclusion that other people know something about these matters as well as themselves. Well, it appears that the Minister of Interior has been taken severely to task by a number of people from Winnipeg who thought they were Free Traders. The Liberal party there had a meeting, at which they challenged this statement made by the hon. Minister of the Interior for the purpose of condemning it. The ground taken by the mover and seconder of the resolution condemning it was that if that was so, they had been grossly deluded—that if that were so they had been deceived by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who had been one of the strongest supporters of a free trade policy, into giving a support to a different policy altogether. A good many of the friends of the hon. Minister of the Interior said there must be some mistake. Although it appeared in the "Globe" and all the other Liberal newspapers, they said there must be some great

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

mistake; it was impossible that a member of a free trade Government could have made such a statement, and they proposed to defer judgment until they had ascertained definitely whether the Minister could have made such a statement. Mr. Jas Porter, however,—I do not know who he is, but he is evidently a very intelligent man—said he believed that Mr. Sifton did make this statement, but did not condemn him for doing so because he thought the tariff was about nearly as perfect as it could be made. His opinion was—I commend this to the Minister of Finance—that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) saw he had made a mistake, and that Mr. Sifton was sent out to declare the real policy of the party and that the party should stand by his declaration. Now, I want to know how these two kings of Brentford stand—whether the hon. Minister of Finance who declares that only the thin end of the wedge has been entered and that the Government are going to keep on reducing the tariff until some point is reached which he has not particularly indicated, is to prevail, or the hon. Minister of the Interior who declares that the present tariff is a finality. I go with the Minister of the Interior. I think that every man who has had an opportunity of studying this question will stand by the policy he has propounded, namely, that the tariff is settled and that that permanency of tariff, which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) discussed at Montreal a year or two ago and declared to be most essential to attain, has been accomplished. It will be found that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior is right and that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, having found he had made a mistake, sent his colleague to proclaim to the world that he was all wrong. But what does one of the hon. gentleman's supporters sitting behind him say on this subject? These hon. gentlemen who are new in the House may suppose that I am drawing upon my imagination, but they will find that I can produce the evidence of hon. gentlemen opposite to prove that the matter is as I have stated it. What does the Winnipeg "Tribune" of March 9th of this year say upon this subject? It says:

There is something almost pathetic in the unconscious irony of Mr. Sifton's assertion that the present tariff is "one that their opponents, if they got the chance, would not change much." Certainly not. Why should the "opponents" change the tariff if they got the chance? It is very largely the tariff which was in force when these "opponents" ceased to have the chance.

Thus speaks the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson):

Does the reduction of one cent per gallon on coal oil, the reduction of 12½ cents duty on binder twine, the removal of the duty from barbed wire, and a preference on British goods to the extent of one-fourth of the scheduled duties, constitute the difference between the Tory protective tariff and "free trade as it is in Eng-