

gentleman who had done so much for his party, a gentleman who, in season and out of season, had never hesitated to raise his voice in defence of the principles which he consistently advocated from the time of entering parliament up to the present session, should have been set aside for men who never did anything for their party. Notwithstanding that fact, he has the satisfaction of knowing that he maintains a better position to-day in the estimation of the people generally and of both political parties, than those who occupy positions that he was so eminently qualified to fill, if I may take the opinion of the hon. leader of the government in this House. We have had denunciations of the tariff *ad nauseam*. I might occupy pages and pages of the official report by reading declarations of a most vehement kind against the tariff and against every man who advocated the policy of protection, but I shall not inflict the House, or myself either, by doing so. There is one thing, however, that I may just as well refer to, and that is, when we take the Liberal platform and read it, and compare it with the declarations of the leaders of the party to-day, we are somewhat amazed that a transformation of so complete a character could possibly take place in so short a period. Was it because of the views which were presented to the hon. gentlemen during their interview with the manufacturers, or was it from some other cause that they were led to adopt the course they take to-day? "Oh, they say, you have involved the country so deeply in debt, that we must have a revenue, and it is only by money raised from customs and excise that we can possibly obtain that revenue." If they were consistent with the views they formerly expressed, that they were free traders of the English schools, or that they desired a tariff for revenue purposes only, there is no difficulty whatever in raising the revenue. Why did not my hon. friend take the same course as the English free traders? If he and his friends were honest in their convictions and declarations prior to the elections, why did they not do as Mr. Reed, the premier of New South Wales did, when he was returned in that country? In New South Wales Mr. Reed opposed Sir George Dibbs, and the issue before the people was free trade and protection. Mr. Reed was a free trader. Under Sir George

Dibbs they had a protective tariff, not only against the outside world, but against the other Australian colonies as well. Mr. Reed declared himself a free trader. He professed sentiments similar to those which have been uttered by every leader of the Liberal party in the Dominion during the last fifteen or sixteen years. In the general election he carried the country as Mr. Laurier has done. He met parliament and at once put his promises into practice, abolished the customs duties from the statute-book, and adopted a free trade policy, pure and simple. He raised his revenue by a land tax and a tax upon income, etc. If hon. gentlemen opposite are honest in their professions, why do they not do the same thing? Simply because they do not dare to carry out, or attempt to carry out the policy they announced when in opposition. Any one who listened to the speech of the late Finance Minister, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, the other night in the House of Commons would come to the conclusion that changing his seat from one side of the House to the other, has had a marvellous effect upon that hon. gentleman, both in his manner of speaking, and in the views which he utters. He had declared in the past that all manufacturers were rascals, great and small; he denounced them as legalized robbers and loud mouthed blatant defenders of a system which was robbing the people. He compared the Conservative government to priests of Baal. He spoke of the shallow clap-trap of the national policy; of the Conservative leaders as wolves, a minstrel troupe and juggling combination—a menagerie—tools and agents of the manufacturers, whom he describes as skilled and drilled cohorts of sinister interests, dangerous to freedom and a standing menace to the government—a far worse set of bandits than the Robber Barons of the Rhine. These are only a few illustrations, yet the other night he was as bland and as courteous and as mild in dealing with this question as my hon. friend sitting opposite will be when he rises to address the House. Yes, and he spoke of vested rights, though when he was in Lanark a short time ago the reports say that in ringing tones, Sir Richard denounced those who had made these investments as loud mouthed blatant blockheads. He said the policy of the Liberal party will bring about a cordial union between Great Britain and the United