

you some figures relating to some particular products. During the three years from 1874 to 1876, our exports of ham and pork amounted to \$4,369,000, and for the three years from 1889 to 1891, under the protective system, they only amounted to \$1,695,000, or a decrease of \$2,674,000 for the three years under the protective system. I would like to know from my hon. friends the Conservative members and in particular from those French representatives of the province of Quebec who support the National Policy, whether we owe this result to the protective policy? From 1874 to 1876, we exported butter to the amount of \$7,498,000, and from 1889 to 1891, under the protective system, we only exported it to the amount of \$1,274,000, or a decrease of \$6,224,000. This falling off in the value of our butter exports, as shown by the figures I have just given, proves that the policy of the Mackenzie Government was more sound and more favourable to the agricultural interests than that of the party now into power, although the Mackenzie Government never thought of going like the present Government into the small butter business. To sum up, the position in which our farmers stand is this: They sell their products at a decrease of 25 per cent, and they buy the protected industrial goods at prices higher by 30, 35, 40, 45 and even 50 per cent than if we had a tariff for revenue system. Another great promise which was made in 1878, was that the population of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, would in 1891, reach at least a million souls, owing to the results obtained from the protective policy. Now the last census only gives them 251,473 souls. Another promise was that made by Sir Charles Tupper. He promised that the price of wheat would go up, and that our far West would produce at least 640,000,000 bushels of it in 1891. Now, what has happened? In 1894, three years after the expiration of the prediction made by Sir Charles Tupper, which I need not say was not realized, they only reaped 180,000,000 bushels of wheat in these parts of our country. However, it was through such promises and false predictions that the voters were led to the polls in 1878. It was through such promises that the resolution moved by Sir John A. Macdonald was passed by the Conservative party then sitting in this House. It was with such arguments that the Mackenzie Government were opposed. They did not say at that time that they intended to raise the tariff higher than 17½ per cent. No, Mr. Speaker, they only referred to a revised tariff. They were also, by means of such a policy, to obtain reciprocity with the United States. It was the object, the tendency avowedly proclaimed by the promoters of the protective system in 1878: it was what the Conservative party then proclaimed. Since then, with respect to this as to any other question, the party now into

power has deceived the electorate, as it did again in 1891, when it contended that it was in favour of reciprocity with the United States, and it obtained a majority under false pretenses. Never was the Government in favour of trade reciprocity with the United States. The hon. gentlemen opposite would not have it, for they are bound to the manufacturers, they cannot wish for any trade reciprocity with the United States, for they well know that this latter country will never accept any partial reciprocity such as proposed by them, because the Republic to the south of us would have a more extended system, comprising both farm produce and manufactured goods. Another promise which was made in 1878, was that the sale of the North-west lands would, as soon as 1892, decrease our debt by at least a hundred million dollars. In 1878, our national debt amounted to \$142,000,000; in 1893, it had reached \$241,641,039, or a deficit, compared with the hopes and promises of Sir Leonard Tilley, the then Minister of Finance, of two hundred million dollars. It is useless to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the two last years, our debt has increased to a truly alarming extent and that it now exceeds three hundred millions. One of the reasons given by the Conservative party in 1878 to catch the votes of the people was that under the protective system, taxes would necessarily be lower. On February 22nd, 1878, Sir Charles Tupper said:

Inasmuch as we governed the country with a small taxation, and inasmuch as we are prepared to govern the country again without those extravagant expenditures made by the present Government since they have been entrusted with power, all we ask is, not that the taxation of the people shall be increased, because we do not require so much money as the hon. gentlemen opposite, as we have shown by our economy in the past, and which we are prepared to practice in the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, they were to rule the country with less taxes than under the Mackenzie regime. I hope the hon. gentlemen opposite will not question these words of Sir Charles Tupper. In 1878, taxes amounted to \$17,841,938; in 1893, they reached \$29,321,367, or an increase of \$11,479,429, and the expenditure was to be much less under the protective system than in 1878, when it amounted to \$23,503,158. In 1894, it amounted to \$37,285,025, or an increase of \$14,081,867. Let me observe, Mr. Speaker, that a large portion of these taxes do not go into the public treasury, but in the pockets of the monopolists, the men protected by the gentlemen opposite. We, on this side of the House, denounce the tariff now in force as a system of robbery and fraud, in that it tends to form combines and monopoly coalitions such as now exist in the manufacture of nails, cotton, sugar, rice and coal oil. As I have stated a moment ago, the main argument of the Conservatives in 1878 had reference to a revision of the tariff and not