

our policy was a policy for the destruction of manufacturers. The Finance Minister himself stated that unless there was a change in the Tariff within two years, almost every manufacturing interest in this country would be closed up. Such extravagant statements being made, and a time of depression existing in the country, ears receive the words they utter and hearts believe them to be true. Had they contemplated and more clearly looked at the position of parties in the history of this country, they would not have entertained the views that some of them appeared to have entertained at that time. What has been the history of political parties with respect to the manufacturers of this country. Their position was not one of antagonism to the manufacturers. I have challenged on the platform, as I challenge the hon. gentleman now, to point out an act of the Mackenzie Administration designed to do an injury to the manufacturing industries of the country; and I defy them to produce a proof of Mr. Mackenzie ever having levelled a blow at those interests. Let them take up that challenge. This is beyond their power, so far as I remember, to prove any act of the kind. But, on the other hand, I can adduce to the House and country, proofs that cannot be refuted, that while the Mackenzie Administration were careful to conserve the rights and interests of all classes of the community, they took care that the manufacturing industries should also have that share of encouragement that I believe they ought to have. Hon. gentlemen opposite say hear, hear. They seem to think it a strange thing for a member to stand on this side of the House and pronounce himself in favor of our manufacturing industries. The member for Lincoln spent three or four hours this afternoon speaking, during which he referred to speeches I have made, and quoted garbled extracts therefrom, as well as from the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and several other members. His object was perhaps a double one. It may have been, primarily, to misrepresent the sentiments of myself and other hon. gentlemen in the House; but he may have had, in the second place, another object in view. He may be cognizant of the fact that nothing he can say would be received on its own merits; and in the speech in which he attempted to argue the question on its merits, he pursued this year precisely the same plan he has pursued on the occasion of every Budget Speech. He made the old argument, searched *Hansard* for proofs, he quoted from eminent speakers portions of their speeches in order that they might appear in the *Hansard* as his own, and lend grace and dignity to that performance. In his speech of last year you will find the same remarks and garbled quotations, and you will see that my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk then referred to his garbled quotations, that he would like to see a retaliatory policy. But, when the hon. member for North Norfolk said that it would be unwise, impolitic and injudicious to attempt a retaliatory policy, did the hon. gentleman opposite quote that utterance of my hon. friend? No, he did not quote it, and he quoted it not designedly, because he had received the explanation, and it was in the *Hansard*, as made by my hon. friend last year. He has quoted from my speech, and said a great deal with reference to it. He pretended to have found a mine there, and the sentiments uttered by me in that speech, he said that I do not hold at present. He is mistaken: I stand here to-night prepared to utter the same sentiments—to say that on no occasion, either in the House or on the platform, do I remember having uttered sentiments contrary to the true tenor of my argument contained in that speech. And I am willing to be held to the tenor of that speech, because, at that time, I uttered the sentiments I believed; and while I hold the right, if my views become enlarged, if my stores of information become any greater, if to-day I see things in a different light, to change my

views and the expressions of my views, I would not disguise my real sentiments. It would, indeed, be strange if, in this Parliament, when the able men on both sides have debated this question with the vigor and power we have seen for many years past, if a man might not learn something new with reference to these matters. But while I am willing to admit that my views may have been, perhaps, a little modified, and that my expressions may have been, in some points, a little toned down by experience, I yet stand here, abiding by the tenor of that speech, when that speech is fairly quoted and taken in its connection. And just permit me here to make an allusion to one instance the hon. gentleman related, in which he was thoroughly unfair to myself in making—that is, in reference to a word or two that passed between me and the hon. the Finance Minister in the course of that hon. gentleman's speech, with reference to an interjection I made, in which the hon. member for Lincoln said to-night that I had denied the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister. I did not deny that statement, and I believe my hon. friend did not so understand me. I have not heard any hon. gentleman during this argument express himself in that way. The hon. the Finance Minister was speaking about the employment of labor and the bringing in of men from the United States. I asked him was there a tax on labor coming in. He replied: "No; but we propose giving laborers the same encouragement that the hon. member complimented his leader for giving to the cigar industry, when he put a duty on cigars, saying it had brought thousands into the country." What I said to the hon. the Finance Minister, which he will admit, was—that it was very nice, but his quotation was not correct. I knew in the speech I made there was a sentiment like that, but at that time I did not think the phraseology ran exactly as it did; and I said the quotation was not exactly correct, and I thought I had said that the effect of the imposition of that duty by the Finance Minister of that day had been the same, as if a thousand men had been brought from other countries and set to work in this country. But I am bound to say that the phraseology of my speech in the *Hansard* did not bear me out, and so far the hon. Finance Minister was right. That is very different to saying that I denied his statement. Now hon. gentlemen opposite understood that, while saying that I was not attempting to repudiate the fact that I had uttered the sentiment that this change of policy had given additional employment to men in this country. That I did say and stand by, because it is the truth, and I desire to speak the truth at all times. But who effected the change in the Tariff that produced that result? We are told the late hon. Finance Minister is a gentleman whose whole aim and policy was to destroy the manufacturing industries of this country. How then will they reconcile that with the fact that through the revision of his Tariff, he was enabled to bring about this result? The hon. gentleman insinuated to-night—and it was an insinuation unworthy of him—that the late hon. Finance Minister yielded to pressure from me, and that the tax was imposed to benefit myself. I think I can stand here in presence of men who know me and say, with a clear conscience, that I have never made anything out of parliamentary life; and if every other hon. gentleman can say the same, with as clear a conscience, I shall be glad. I stand here to-night to defend the changes in the Tariff effected by the late Finance Minister. I propose to take that very change as an illustration of the principle that would guide me in a revision of the Tariff. I take that very instance as a proof of the ability and wisdom of that hon. gentleman so much denounced by hon. gentlemen opposite as an enemy of the manufacturers and unable to grapple with the commercial questions of this country. I take that instance as a refutation of such assertions. I am told this change affected the cigar industry. While he remembers this, it is not so men-