

nothing against the manufacturer further than this, that I do not wish him to have exclusive privileges. I desire that he should succeed and prosper, but I do not want him to enjoy greater privileges than the farmer, the lumberman, the fisherman and the miner. Let each prosecute his industry, relying on his own economy, industry and foresight, and work out his way to prosperity without the aid of Government and without special privileges. I believe the people of this country will denounce this system, which makes all these great interests tributary to the manufacturing interest, when it is brought properly before them again.

With regard to the manufacturer there is one feature of the burdens imposed upon the people of this country in consequence of the policy conceived in the interest of that class, to which I wish to call the attention of the House. In the investigation made by the Hon. Robert J. Walker, the Hon. Wm. Burchard and the Hon. Wm. Springer, three high authorities in the United States, they gave, as the outcome of their inquiries, this result: that the incidental taxation in the United States—that is the increased cost of domestic goods in consequence of the increased duty as compared with the cost of these goods laid down if no duty existed—is fourteen as compared with five. That is for every five dollars of duty levied under the protective system, there are fourteen dollars of indirect taxation, in the shape of enhanced cost of the domestic product which the consumer has to pay; so that for every five dollars duty the Government collected, the consumer had to pay an extra fourteen dollars to the manufacturer. That has been shown by a very interesting table made up by Mr. Springer. He took twelve classes of goods, and showed that the importations in one year amounted to the sum of \$433,173,000, the duty on which amounted to \$194,464,000. The domestic manufacture of these goods in the United States amounted to \$2,440,502,000; the hands employed numbered 1,327,000; the wages paid \$463,606,000; and the increased cost of these goods, in consequence of protection, was \$556,938,000; so that this incidental tax or the increased cost over the entire amount of wages paid in the production of these goods was \$93,322,000. Now, if we take the production of domestic goods in Canada and attempt to arrive at a conclusion as to what the incidental tax is, we will find that the burdens placed upon the people of Canada by the customs duty is small as compared with that placed upon them by the enhanced cost or the incidental taxation. From the year 1881 to the year 1889-90 the customs taxation amounted to \$213,510,000. If the American tables are to be relied upon we will find that an enormous amount has been contributed by the Canadian consumer in the shape of incidental taxes paid the manufacturer. We will suppose the amount, as compared with the customs duties paid, to be two to one instead of fourteen to five, and the result will be that we have had to pay during those years from 1881 to 1890, \$213,510,000 in customs duties, and our incidental taxation has amounted to \$427,000,000. We paid over \$213,000,000 in duties, and over \$427,000,000 in enhanced cost more than the goods could have been laid down for in Canada if the duties were abolished. That is to say, that there has been an average for a population of 4,500,000 of \$47.44 *per capita* for customs duties, and for in-

cidental duties of \$94.89, or a total of \$143.33, making an average of \$14.24 *per capita* per annum. Is it any wonder that we have hard times? Is it any wonder that we have depression in this country? Is it any wonder that trusts and combines exercise great power upon this Government? I suppose they were brought up to the point when they were ready to contribute in the first place by my right hon. friend, who is said to have met a deputation of these gentlemen in the "Red Parlour," and he said he required some funds, but the amount asked for was rather large.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that was in the year 1882. The manufacturers told him that his demands were unreasonable, and that they could not contribute so large a sum. The reply of Sir John was that the Government had fixed the duties to suit them and now they must respond. Why, gentlemen, said he, you remind me of a drove of hogs under the trees picking up apples: each hog desiring to have more than the other hog, and none of them having sense enough to look up and see the beneficent hand above that shakes the apples down to them; you contribute and I will shake the apples, but if you don't put up I will quit shaking down: and ever since these gentlemen have been agreed with the First Minister, and have put up upon demand, and the apples have been shaken down in great abundance.

In the course of the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, I find that he has taken up certain stock objections to the policy of the Liberal party of Canada, and the first objection which he advances is to accuse my hon. friend on my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) of advocating a policy which would leave us under the control of the American Government in the arrangement of tariff, and double our rate of duties. The American customs duties are less *per capita* than our own, but the hon. gentleman's statement shows an entire misconception of our policy. It is not proposed that our tariff against foreign countries shall be regulated by the American Government. That is not the policy of the Liberal party. The policy of the Liberal party is the free admission of the products of the United States into Canada, and the free admission of the products of Canada into the United States, but we propose, while admitting all American products free, to impose such a tariff as we choose on the products of any other country. We propose to be our own master in that respect, and to retain our power to impose such duty as we may see fit on every importation from any other country. The argument of my hon. friend the Finance Minister is founded on a false assumption. Canada will not negotiate any treaty which puts our tariff under the control of any other power. That is his statement and in that he is perfectly correct. We do not propose to negotiate any such treaty. Even if we were to adopt commercial union, we would not negotiate any such treaty, because we would not enter into commercial union without having all the features of the scheme definitely settled. In that scheme we would decide what the common tariff should be, and, unless we could agree as to the features of that common tariff, and the mode of making changes, we would not enter into that arrangement and would not give to the United