

mindful and patriotic the Hon. Mr. Joly was; how he was "enshrined in the hearts of the people," and deserved to be. How was it, then, that the Conservatives were taunted to-day by the Liberals as being deceivers of the people, selfish politicians, enemies of progress, and heartless oppressors, because they reduced into practice the very principles laid down and advocated by their friend and ally, whose intelligence and patriotism had been so highly praised? Well, it must be because Mr. Joly had the unenviable courage to speak and canvass, from one end of the Province of Quebec to the other, during the last Federal elections, in favour of a Government policy which he previously avowed to be opposed to his principles, and contrary to the welfare of the country. Why did he do so? There was but one plausible explanation for so strange a conduct, not to say more; he was evidently paying a debt of gratitude to the secret influence which had brought him into power in the extraordinary way known to all. He (Mr. Houde) desired next to quote a still greater authority, the hon. leader of the Opposition himself. In his speech at Hamilton, on the 16th of January, 1874, on the eve of the general elections, when he was seeking the votes of the manufacturers and workingmen, as well as those of the farmers, the hon. gentleman spoke as follows:—

"As I have just said, all parties in the country have accepted the doctrine I lay down, that our revenue must be obtained by means of duties upon imported goods, and the distribution of these duties should always be in such a way as to confer the greatest amount of benefit upon our own people. (Loud cheers.) Then, Sir, with regard to the amount of duty, some say, at least, it will be reduced. I do not contemplate the possibility of its reduction, and in view of the vast public undertakings to which the country is pledged, in the enlargement and completion of our canal system, and the construction of the Pacific Railway, we will be obliged, I fear, to increase it very materially at no distant day, unless the country becomes a great deal richer and more prosperous, during years to come, than we have reason to expect, judging by the past. So that the question of Protection or Free-trade does not arise in this contest at all. Sir Francis Hincks stated, last year, on his election tour, and in the House of Commons, that he was in favour of incidental Protection. I said I was also in favour of it. (Hear! hear!) It is a stupid phrase at best, but it means

MR. HOUDE.

simply this, that as long as duties are levied upon articles imported, they should be levied upon articles produced by our own people. (Cheers.) I do not know a single man in the ranks of my own party who is opposed to that political theory."

So then, the hon. leader of the present Opposition thought and avowed that, in framing or readjusting a tariff, a Government ought to arrange it in such a way as to confer the greatest amount of benefit upon its own people. Therefore, he acknowledged that it was possible, and not only possible but desirable, to help the people to become more prosperous by legislation. Now he contended, with his followers, that it was impossible to do so, that it was foolish to undertake it. Then, he contemplated also "a very material increase" of the tariff, "at no distant day." Why did he oppose it to-day? Was it because the country had "become a great deal richer and more prosperous during" the five years of his Administration? Who would dare to pretend that? According to his own declaration, he did not anticipate such an increase of public wealth and prosperity, and he knew now that it had not taken place. However, he was opposed to that "material increase" of the tariff at a time when it was much more required, by circumstances, than when he made the country believe that his Government would propose it "at no distant day." Surely, it would be difficult to imagine anybody in more open contradiction than the hon. leader of the Opposition had placed himself, as had done also his followers. Of course, that was not partisanship, since it applied to the faultless party, a party so good and with so large and elevated views that the present generation could not understand them. Very likely the next one would not either, unless it underwent some considerable change. The hon. gentlemen could have changed their opinions on such questions, and still be sincere, and deserved to be considered so, provided they had something else than abuse for their opponents to rely upon, and respected more than they seemed disposed to do the convictions of those who happened to disagree with them. Let them prove, if they could, that the new tariff would injure the interests of the country; they had that right. But they had no right to impugn the motives of the present supporters of that policy.