

deliberate breach of faith, whilst the independent element cannot be expected to do so.

What said the Toronto "Globe" before it got the tip to go slow upon the matter of the tariff revision?

The repeal or reduction of the raw material duties will, no doubt, be one of his first acts.

* * * Notwithstanding the terrific tariff and the bounties, therefore, we are still an almost infinite way from the protectionist ideal of making all our own iron and steel goods at home, while the tax that was to give Ontario coal from Cape Breton as cheap, or cheaper, than the foreign, turns out to be a fine of \$300,000 a year on the manufacturers in this province. That Ontario can flourish as a seat of industry under these cruel imposts on the two fundamental articles of all industry, can be believed by no one, unless he allows his partisanship to put out the eye of his understanding.

A very picturesque phrase, indeed. Well, Sir, not only are these papers so talking and so thinking, but as I said, the "Witness" has been for the last ten days calling to the mind of its leaders the pledges which they made, and refusing to believe the dubious hints that are going about the streets of Montreal that after all the protective element will be taken into the tariff, refusing to believe what they had heard, declaring that:

With all this we are in agreement; and we earnestly hope, and have faith, that the Liberals will not betray the cause of free trade and tariff reform and play into the hands of the protectionists, though we are not certain that it would not be politic to cease for a time to urge reciprocity with the United States.

And its final article on "No Surrender," winds up with this:

If the readers of the Liberal journals which published this plank of the party in June last so frequently, voted for the Liberal candidates in reliance upon the word of these journals that the party would be true to its pledges, they must feel sadly betrayed as they read the editorials of these same journals to-day, excusing and defending in anticipation an expected surrender to the protected interests. For our part, we confidently expect the Government to carry out the policy outlined in the above tariff plank of the Liberal platform.

Well, Sir, the final act came, as it must in every case take place, and yesterday we had the Budget brought down to the House. I forgot to mention one other episode, however, which showed that same spirit of wavering, and gave hints of a betrayal of pledges, the celebrated coal episode, but as that has been so well discussed and so thoroughly, I simply mention it as one of others, and will not further transgress upon the patience of the House with regard to it. At last, Sir, the eventful day comes, and the Finance Minister of the Liberal party, which has been out of office and subject to that fiery discipline which makes for principle and purity of motive for eighteen years, finds itself in the position of coming before Parliament and the electorate, and

being judged as to its worth, judged as to its faith and honesty, judged as to whether it meant to do anything more than simply canvass, judged as to whether it ignorantly did what it did, and will now frankly confess that it did it ignorantly. For there are but two horns to the dilemma; either the hon. gentlemen made these pledges on principle, and believing that they understood the conditions of this country and foreign countries sufficiently well to tell us unmistakably that they knew what was right and what was wanted by this country—either that, or else they simply were catering for public support irrespective of what they would do after they came into a position of power and responsibility. Will they admit the plea of ignorance; they discredit themselves as statesmen and public men. Will they admit the other, which they are practically doing by going back on their pledges? then they must confess that they are putting themselves in the position of breaking faith and betraying confidence, and that they were not worthy of the support of the Canadian electorate. Yesterday, then, we had the announcement, and yesterday we had a spectacle in this House which, I am quite certain, was never seen before in this Dominion Parliament, and which it will be very difficult ever to put upon the boards a second time in this same Parliament. There was, first, Sir, an elaborate historic reminiscence, which had nothing to do with the principle of the question at all, the sum and substance of that reminiscence being that in 1867 there was a tacit agreement that at that time, at least, the duties should be moderate—an unwritten treaty, my hon. friend characterized it. Well, whatever may have been the thoughts which statesmen may have communicated to each other and which they carried out in practice afterwards, whether you call it an unwritten treaty or a private understanding, no man has any right to make that an argument for the absolute maintenance of that status for all the years of progress of the great Dominion which at that moment was being founded. What pertinence, then, had that argument to the question in point? To-day we are twenty-seven years of age, then we were but in our infancy, then we were four provinces, and now we are this broad Dominion. In 1867 the conditions surrounding us were as widely different from the conditions of to-day as light is from darkness. In 1867 the conditions internally were as different as possible from the conditions of this country internally to-day. That to change a tariff, in rate or principle, which was thought to be the best for the opening years of confederation implies that there is a breach of faith if that change is made in the years of progress and development, is an argument which I think my hon. friend will scarcely adopt at another presentation, and which is scarcely worthy of being brought into the financial utterance. Then, Sir, he says that