

35 per cent. over what they were previous to the putting in force of the present Tariff. He goes on to say that protection has the result of imposing excessively high duties on products required in manufactures, and notwithstanding that, he tells us that instead of increasing, raw wool has decreased 30 per cent., which is at once a contradiction of his first assertion. In speaking of sugar, the hon. member asserts that the price of that article has increased, and he adds that the Tariff of the ex-Minister of Finance brought in more revenue than does the present Tariff. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Tariff of the ex-Minister brought in more revenue to the Treasury, it is probably because the duties at that time were higher than those levied now; it was necessary to levy higher duties, because it is duties that contribute to the increase of the funds of the Treasury. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the best answer to be made to the hon. member for Lotbinière, and to all others who pretend that the present Tariff is injurious to the people, is to make an appointment with them in presence of the people at the next elections. It was they who heralded that doctrine in 1878. At that time the country was suffering from commercial depression; at that time the Government in power could in no way remedy the state of things existing throughout the country. It was then that we came before the people in 1878. These hon. gentlemen pretended that they could save the country with Free Trade. We, on the other hand, maintained that we could not deliver the country from the evils from which it was suffering without adopting the more rational policy of protection. The contest took place and the people pronounced themselves in a decided manner for the adoption of protection. Isolated elections have taken place since then; from year to year, members have come before the people, either through a vacancy occurring in a constituency, or for other reasons, and on those occasions, when the people have been afforded a new opportunity for expressing an opinion, they have invariably—the facts are there to bear out what I state—by a large majority returned to Parliament members who supported the present policy of the Government. I will now come to the second charge preferred by the hon. member for Lotbinière, for I do not wish to abuse the patient hearing granted to me by this honorable House. This is what the hon. member says, when speaking of the expenses of the Administration:

"The accusation of extravagance brought against the Mackenzie Government was a bit of effrontery on the part of those who had increased public expenditure to \$13,000,000, in 1867, and \$23,316,000, in 1873."

Mr. Speaker, in order to be able to discuss it in all freedom, I think we should determine the basis of the discussion; it becomes necessary to make a comparative study of the two Administrations—between the first Conservative Administration, from 1867 to 1873, and that which succeeded it in 1873. I think it is important to know on what ground we are manoeuvring. According to the figures given to us by the hon. member, I understand that in his study of the question, he gives to us the year 1873-74, whilst he gives the year 1878-79 to the Liberals. If I am mistaken, I beg he will correct me.

Mr. RINFRET. If the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) requires explanations, I can give him some. I did not take into calculation the year 1878-79, because the Estimates that we made in 1878 were considerably exceeded by the Conservative party when it came into power; whereas we, in 1878, remained within the Estimates prepared by the hon. Minister of Finance; thus it is completely impossible for us to take upon ourselves the responsibility of the increase that took place in the Estimates of 1878.

Mr. LANDRY. I think that the hon. member is muddling the question instead of throwing any light upon it. If the hon. member gives us the fiscal year of 1873-74, I think that in all justice he is bound to take 1878-79.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDRY. I think it was on the 7th November, 1873, that we lost the reins of Government, and those hon. gentlemen left office in October, 1878. Well, if they give us the whole of the fiscal year 1873-74, although they were in power nine months of that year, I think that they should take in exchange the fiscal year 1878-79; and I ask the hon. member if he will take that basis to establish any discussion whatsoever on.

Mr. RINFRET. I have given my explanations. I have said that we remained within the Estimates of 1873, and that our Estimates of 1878 had been considerably exceeded, and that we could not be held responsible for the surplus spent by the Conservative party.

Mr. LANDRY. This signifies that the hon. member holds us responsible for the whole of the increase which they created in the public service during the year 1873-74, but that he has not the courage to undertake the responsibility of the expenses for the year 1878-79. I expected more justice and more generosity on the part of the hon. member; and I thought that as he wished to shoulder us with the responsibility of the expenses of the nine months of administration during which they were in power, he would also have the courage to take the responsibility of the nine months of our administration in 1878-79. The hon. member tells us that we brought the expenses up to \$13,000,000 to which they amounted in 1867, to \$23,316,000 for the year ending 30th June, 1874, thus giving us the fiscal year of 1873-74. When, further on, he speaks of the public debt, he willingly forgets 1873, to be able to say that on the 1st July, 1874, our national debt amounted to so much, leaving to us the whole responsibility of its increase to that date. I ask the special attention of the hon. member, for I am about to show him the contradiction that exists between the assertions he has just made with that he made in his speech the other day. This is what the hon. member said: "The Liberal Government, during its five years of power, brought its expenses to \$23,500,000 only." But what does the hon. member leave us? Why, the year 1873-74. Starting from the 1st July, 1874, he says that the Liberal Government, during its five years of power, brought the expenses up to \$23,500,000; consequently, if the hon. member wishes to reckon five years from the 1st July, 1874, he is forcibly compelled to go to the 1st July, 1879, or calculation is a mere word. Thus, the fiscal year 1878-79, according to the hon. member for Lotbinière himself, must be imputed to the Liberals, otherwise we find that the Liberals were but four years in power, which is incorrect. Well, let us take the assertions made by the hon. member before this House, and let us prove to him that the figures he has given have not been given correctly, and that to the detriment of the Conservatives and the advantage of the Liberals. I will, in the first place, accept the gift of the hon. member, and I will take the year 1873-74 as one of our years, because the Budget that had been brought down by the present Minister of Finance, and who was Finance Minister at that date, determined, one may say, the expenses to be incurred during that year 1873-74. If for the expenditure of administration we take the figures given us by public documents, we find that from year to year the Conservative party, from 1867 to 1874, placed considerable amounts aside. We have to notice a period of surpluses. The first year, it is \$201,835.53; the second, \$341,090.52; the third, \$1,166,716.07; the fourth, \$3,712,479.09; the fifth, \$3,125,344.86, and so on from year to year, so that during the first Conservative Administration