

States. He did not wonder that the right hon. gentleman and his friends desired to divert public attention from the real merits of the question. It was natural that these gentlemen, feeling the false position in which they stood with regard to a measure of this importance, feeling that this country held them responsible for the position in which the lumber and coal interests and the interests of the country generally were placed, should seek by some side issue to divert public attention from their responsibility. All the speeches and motions of the right hon. gentleman would never take away the responsibility which attached to himself, his Government and his party, for having placed those great interests in their present unfavourable position. The hon. member for Cumberland had led the House to understand this evening, that the American policy of Protection had been so successful, that it was increasing their exports and driving all other countries out of the markets of the world. The hon. member was not always such a Protectionist. He took the hon. member for North Oxford to task for having changed his views during the past four or five years on this question. He (Mr. Jones) thought the House would admire the frankness with which the hon. member for North Oxford admitted he had changed his views on that question. The hon. member for Cumberland delivered a speech at Wellington in 1872, reported in the *Mail* of November, 1872, in which he contrasted the position occupied by the Dominion at that time, with the embarrassing position which they occupied previous to the entrance of the Maritime Provinces into Confederation. The hon. gentleman was reported to have said:

“He would now ask the electors, as he had a right to ask them, standing there as a representative of Nova Scotia, to look at the position the old Province of Canada occupied previous to the Union, with a high tariff of 25 per cent., with a rate of taxation which proved a most oppressive burden upon the people, unable, notwithstanding this high tariff, to pay its way, with the credit of the country impaired, with its finances embarrassed and the treasury nearly bankrupt, and to contrast that with the present condition of affairs when the whole country was prosperous.”

MR. JONES.

At this time, remember, the tariff had been reduced from 25 per cent. to 15 per cent. When these hon. gentlemen first entertained the proposition of the Union, they knew that the tariff of the old Province of Canada was so high that they never could induce the people of the Maritime Provinces to join them unless they reduced the tariff. The tariff was reduced from 25 per cent. to 15 per cent. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues went to London to negotiate the question of the Union, and were there met by the delegates of Nova Scotia, of which the hon. member for Cumberland was one. They were also met there by a deputation from the anti-confederates of Nova Scotia, who were opposed to the groundwork upon which the Union was proposed to be consummated. Mr. Adams, who was on the anti-Union delegation, wrote a pamphlet in London, taking the ground that the people of the Maritime Provinces were opposed to the Union with Canada because they had undertaken a protective policy; because, at that time the Maritime Provinces had a low tariff of 10 per cent., and the moment they joined the Union it would be raised to 15, and probably 25 per cent., as it was understood that it had been reduced to 15 per cent. only for political purposes and to carry Confederation. The hon. member for Cumberland was on the delegation, and had, as one of his associates, Judge McCulloch, who wrote a pamphlet in reply to Mr. Adams. That was the view taken by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues, because the right hon. gentleman was there, guiding, no doubt, the discussion, and influencing, no doubt, the very document written in reply to Mr. Adams. When he bated his Confederation mouse-trap he had to use the best bait he could get.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think my hon. friend is one of the biggest rats caught in the trap.

MR. JONES: Every argument possible had to be brought forward against Mr. Adam, and the principal argument used was that Canada having once gone back on its protective policy and on the protective traditions