

---it is a comparatively small one and has my deepest sympathy---which is in difficulties. The country as a whole, however, is not suffering distress, but is tolerably prosperous---immensely more prosperous than during the crisis of 1857. Yet we did not hear that the Government of that day were to blame for the condition in which the country then was. But the hon. gentleman proposed a remedy for the depression for the first time. When he made his speech a few evenings ago, it was quite evident he was on the wrong track. He had prepared a speech he could not deliver, which explains his peculiar manner of jumping from one subject to another. The hon. gentleman thought additional taxation was to be proposed, and he was prepared to expatiate upon the wickedness of imposing additional taxation. Now he asserts that the remedy for the great distress is to impose additional taxation. It is a curious remedy, if it is a remedy. It is the duty of Government when distress exists amongst any large class of the population to relieve it if it can be done consistently with the general interests of the country; it is the duty of the Government when revenue fails to practice the most rigid economy; but it is not the duty of the Government always when distress prevails to propose additional taxation as the only possible remedy.

With regard to the one question on which the hon. gentleman has pronounced himself strongly to-night---that of a protective policy---I think while it would benefit a certain class, the benefit would be reaped at the expense of another. We have all accepted a revenue tariff as the policy of the country for the time being. That this revenue tariff has been so high is chiefly owing to the extravagance into which the country was plunged by hon. gentlemen opposite. But the hon. gentleman said that the Government led the country to believe there was to be a change of policy. Nay, Sir, he went further; he stated that he had a policy carefully prepared. I tell him he is mistaken. There was no such policy prepared, and no such announcement was made to the public either directly or indirectly. The Government never led a single indi-

vidual in this House to believe they would propose additional taxation. The Government, as they were bound to do, maintained a most rigid silence towards their intimate friends as to the policy they would bring down. But the hon. gentleman and his organs proclaimed for weeks and months that there was an enormous deficit, pointed out the absolute necessity for an increased taxation, and so tried to influence the Government. But when they found this failed their rage knew no bounds, and hence the fierce denunciations of hon. gentlemen opposite as to our policy.

Mr. BOWELL---Did not the *Globe* make precisely the same announcement?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE---I don't know what it did. The *Globe* is not my paper, and I am not responsible in any way for its statement. The hon. gentleman has my leave to enquire if he likes whether the *Globe* had any authority to make such a statement.

Mr. BOWELL---I made no such charge; but the hon. gentleman charged that the Opposition press misled the people.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE---It did, months before.

Mr. BOWELL---Well, the *Globe* did the same thing.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE---The statement was made in that paper on Friday morning, the day the Budget came down. We don't make confidantes of any newspaper. It has been said that we made a direct intimation of our policy. The hon. member for Cumberland pretends we had a policy prepared. I know that many things which have taken place in Council during the last two years have become known, but it is impossible that this could have become known.

Mr. MASSON---The hon. member for Chateaugay, in the City of Montreal, stated that a revision of the tariff was contemplated.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE---The Hon. gentleman was entitled to his opinion.

Mr. MASSON---Then the hon. gentleman could not lay the charge at our door, that the Opposition press cir-