

not the application of this principle they would not increase the taxation, but would readjust it. The actual taxation during the 16 years from 1879 to 1894, the result of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, was to draw from the people through the custom-houses and Excise Department, \$428,814,301. Had the people paid the same rate per head during all those years as they paid per head during the five years of the Liberal Administration, namely, \$4.81½, there would have been \$356,028,961 taken from them. In other words, the actual amount taken from the people from 1879 to 1894 by those hon. gentlemen, more than would have been taken under the Mackenzie Administration, was \$72,785,725. And this was done under a policy which was pledged not to increase the taxation of the country.

To put it in another way : The Mackenzie Government would have taken \$72,785,725 less if they had been in power during the last sixteen years. The average annual increase made by hon. gentlemen opposite in the amount of taxation was \$4,549,108 over the rate of the Mackenzie regime. But this does not tell the whole story. They blamed the Mackenzie Government for deficits during their career. Had the Mackenzie Administration taxed the people on an average per head as those hon. gentlemen taxed them in 1894, a year in which they boasted of reductions made in taxation and when the Government professed to give the people the benefit of reduced taxation by many millions of money which they had previously taken from them, the average taxation from customs and excise would have been \$5.55. Had Mr. Mackenzie been allowed by Parliament and the people to tax them during his five years of office at the rate of \$5.55 per head, he would have obtained \$107,358,036 ; but he actually levied \$4.81 per head, which gave him \$94,948,340, showing that had the rate of taxation which prevailed in 1894 been allowed to Sir Richard Cartwright during his five years of office, there would have been \$12,402,496 more than he did obtain, and taking out the deficits for two years in which he had deficits, he would have had a net surplus during those years of \$9,737,958. This proves conclusively that had the Liberal Government given away to the temptations that were held out to them to increase the taxation on the people, even during the years of depression, it would easily have swamped the deficit and resulted in the enormous surplus of \$9,737,958.

But, Sir, let us run through some of these intervening years and see what the taxation that these hon. gentlemen have imposed would have given to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as Finance Minister. I have referred to the first period of their rule, and I will now take the period from 1882 to 1888. The average taxation of the Conservative Government during these five years

produced \$112,109,089, the average rate being \$5.79 per capita. If Mr. Mackenzie had had that taxation during his term of office, he would have had a net surplus of \$14,486,211. Take the next five years, from 1888 to 1893. If Mr. Mackenzie had been allowed to have taxed these people an average of \$6.21 per head, as these gentlemen opposite taxed the people of the country, he would have a net surplus, between 1874 and 1878, of \$22,504,003, which shows the enormity of the offence which the Conservative Government were guilty of receiving the confidence of the people in 1878 upon the basis of not increasing taxation, and proceeding to enormously increase it, afterwards boasting of the surpluses which it gave them.

I think I have shown, Sir, that the policy which the Conservative party has adopted has done nothing whatever to increase the substantial prosperity of the people. That increase resulted entirely from the profits of their export trade. I have shown, too, that the present Government have violated the promises which they made in regard to the keeping the expenditure within the limits of the expenditure of the Mackenzie Administration, for I have proven that they did enormously increase the expenditure, and thus violated that promise.

I may have occasion before I resume my seat to allude more in detail to some of these particulars, but at the present time I will take up another point of the argument invariably made by hon. gentlemen opposite. One of the points always made by every ministerial speaker, at any rate, during the latter portion of the discussion upon the benefits of the National Policy, has been to attack the operations of the revenue tariff in the mother country. They claim to be pre-eminently the party of patriotism and loyalty ; but they find no language too contemptuous with which to speak of the policy of the statesmen of England. Although the hon. the Minister of Justice is not present, some of the remarks which I will make upon that point are directed to observations made by him in this House : observations which seem to have been followed up by Government speakers and by Government organs throughout the country, as a safe line on which to prejudice the people of Canada against the reforms which are favoured by the Liberal party.

It is well known that all the governing classes of Great Britain strongly support what is called a free trade policy, but which might more properly be called the revenue tariff policy of the mother country. Hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes try to make capital out of the assumption that the Liberal party, while favouring the free trade principle upon which Great Britain collects a revenue, favour a tariff precisely like that of the United Kingdom. This assumption is misleading to the last degree. It is the principle we are discussing, and