

our country of the small factories. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman meant. Surely he could not have meant to say that if the Reform party had been in power from 1878 to the present, we would have gone on manufacturing our carriages, buggies, sleighs, cutters and carts at the little wagon shops, and that the blacksmith would have gone on making his own horse-shoes and nails as in the past, and that we would have made no progress. And if he desires to have those days brought back to us by legislation, he would find very few supporters in this House. The fact is it became a serious question for us whether, in our own cities, we would manufacture in the large way our own carriages and our own boots and shoes and other articles we require or whether we should go on importing them from the United States. I think that the policy of the late Government tended very largely to develop the best interests of the country, although, in any event, no matter what kind of legislation we had, I believe we would still have made some progress, because I do not believe that it is possible to hinder the progress of a country like ours.

I now come to another statement made by the hon. Finance Minister which is a little peculiar. He said :

The question arises as to how far we shall be able to apply at once, or at an early day, these principles of tariff reform which we have in the past declared we wished to carry out. \* \* \* No man who ever spoke in the name of the Liberal party of Canada, ever announced that we were going at one step to adopt the principles of free trade to that extent.

I do not understand why the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) made such a statement, for I give him credit for reading the speeches of his colleagues and knowing what they have said on the subject. He must surely be aware of the very strong statement which the hon. gentleman who sits beside him (Sir Richard Cartwright) made, and which I shall read for the benefit of the hon. gentleman and this House :

We will collect a revenue by duties placed upon articles which we cannot produce in Canada. \* \* It is the only possible method of taking every vestige of protection out of the tariff and still raising a revenue.

It seems to me that that looks very like free trade. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has not carried out that policy, but has joined the protectionists, because I believe that our industries should be protected, and that we should not raise a revenue on the lines therein indicated. But he made another statement on the 25th of October, 1894 :

The time is ripe for very extensive and far-reaching reforms. I, for my part, would be sorry to see the issue dwindle down to a mere question of revenue tariff. We need, among other things, a radical readjustment, not only of our tariff, but of the whole system of taxation.

I do not think that these hon. gentlemen have carried that out very effectively. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) took a very active part in the revision of the tariff or not, but if he did I would have expected a much more free trade tariff than the one he has, and to that extent, I am very glad that he was ignored. There was, in fact, a rumour at one time that possibly he might resign, and I am surprised that he has remained in a Government whose principles are evidently protective. It is true that up to six o'clock the hon. Finance Minister treated us to a purely free trade speech, and there may have been method in his madness. He may have spoken under the impression that the people would read his speech and not look into the tariff. A good many comments have been made on the tariff by newspapers friendly to the Government. The Toronto "Globe" last Saturday, said that the only justification for the duties being kept on soft coal and of the likelihood of a duty being charged on hard coal was that it might lead to reciprocity in the coal business, and then the "Globe" went on to say that it could not understand why the duties were raised on cottons. I think the hon. Finance Minister did not make that very clear, but it is difficult to explain the speech of the Finance Minister unless on the theory of the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) that the Government first put up the duty in order that they might afterwards give a preference to Great Britain and other countries. Then they did not eliminate all the duties on iron, because, according to the "Globe," the bounty will continue until 1902, and the "Globe" says :

The changes made will provide cheap raw material, and at the same time protect the best producing interest of the Dominion.

I thought that when the Liberals were returned we would lose all the protection, but that has not been the case I am glad to say. Let me quote a very strong reason given by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce why this tariff should be a free trade tariff. It was because the people were being robbed on every hand by the villainous system of protection. This will be found in "Hansard" of 1893, page 710 :

We are obliged every year, either on account of individual or general indebtedness, to pay a sum of \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 to our English creditors. Further than that, Canada is an enormously-taxed country. First of all, there is a tax of \$30,000,000 which goes into the Federal Treasury ; next to that there is a tax, as I believe, about quite equal, which goes into the pockets of the protected manufacturers ; and, thirdly, there is a very heavy tax paid to the United States Government under the operation of the McKinley tariff.

Then at page 717 of "Hansard" of 1893, he said :