

declaring for continental free trade, a declaration made in a speech in which I was amazed to see he went back to the war time and was somewhat unfaithful to Canada, and I thought unjust to England, to gain the applause of the Americans who were listening to him. When I read that speech I could not help remembering how a great Liberal and a great man, and splendid orator behaved in the teeth of the war sentiment, when men were aroused and almost mad, how Joe. Howe attended a great meeting held at Detroit in 1865, stood before the people and told them he would not take back one single action, that the people of Canada behaved as a free people should have done, and he asked them: Is there an Irishman, Englishman, Scotchman or American who would for one moment surrender the right of asylum to people coming from other countries? That was the way in which a great man and a great patriot acted on that occasion. Then we come back to 1892, when there was a wobble again. Again, in 1893, there was something different. Now, in 1894, we have their new policy defined. That policy is a curious one, because I find in the speeches of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), and other hon. members on the Opposition side of the House that they are constantly harking back to the beauties of reciprocity with the United States and point out the value of the American market. They are belated reciprocityists; they are belated politicians; they are unable, however, to change with the facility of their leaders, whose views change with the regularity of pilots looking out on a shifting sky, and as they find the breeze veer, trim their sails and fix their rudders. Sir, the hon. gentlemen were discordant in their own speeches; they were discordant in their own cries and in their oratory—shall I call it oratory, or is it not the parrottery of discordant cries? Take the very point that hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to make, namely, that so much money has been taken out of the pockets of the people by the manufacturers that in sixteen years a billion of money has been extracted. Of course if that is so, the result must be that not only would the manufacturers under the policy of the Conservative Government put the natural profit into their pockets, but also put into their pockets the amount which it is said is given them, because, and an hon. gentleman repeated it to-day—they have it as pat as a b c, and can go over it as a child can go over its alphabet, but if they go over it for ever it will be useless and have no effect because its monstrously ridiculous character is manifest the moment it is stated—they say the manufacturers get not merely the natural profits on what they manufacture, but also the duty, and not only the duty but the percentage on the duty, and not only that but they put so much in their

Mr. DAVIN.

pockets in addition and they are thus able to fleece the country; and this last sum never goes into the treasury. I have stated that the Reform party in this House is a party of discordant cries, and I find proof of this in the speeches of several hon. members, including the hon. member for Oxford and the hon. member for North Norfolk, because the hon. member for North Norfolk committed himself to this one point, which I dwell on, for it is the centre of their position, and the falsity of which, if proved before a public audience, breaks through their line of battle. We need not trouble to answer them because they answer themselves. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) makes precisely the same statement as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and precisely the same statement as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). Yet in his own speech is found a triumphant answer, where he endeavours to show that the manufacturers were as successful from 1871 to 1878, and from 1868 to 1871, as they were subsequently under the National Policy, and this is what he says:

If it can be shown that, even though the product was larger in 1871 or in 1881, the business was still unprofitable, some argument would be given in favour of a change which would make the business more profitable. What do the figures show?

He asked triumphantly what do the figures show? And he finds that the percentage of profits in 1871 for the manufacturers was 73 and in 1881 it was 42 per cent. One would think that under this protective system, by which the manufacturers are said, by hon. gentlemen on the Liberal benches, to put large sums of money into their pockets, that the profits would be much higher in 1891, but alas, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) finds that in 1891 the percentage of profit was only 33·6 as compared with a higher profit in 1881, and a still higher profit in 1871. Let us ask these gentlemen: where then did all this money go that was taken out of the pockets of the people and put into the pockets of the manufacturers? The moment they are posed with that question, we have them saying, as the hon. member for Queen's said "Oh, it is taken out of the pockets of the people but nevertheless it ruins the manufacturer." They tell us that the manufacturer gets not only the natural profit on what he produces, but that he also gets a percentage on the very duty, and nevertheless that it ruins him completely. Such a contention as that has only to be stated in order that its absurdity may be seen. The hon. member (Mr. Davies) again made, what struck me as a very peculiar assertion. He told us that the Liberal party were not going to be "free traders as they are in England"; although I confess that I thought I actually heard the leader of the Opposition say so. I thought I heard that the hon.