

moments, to the very grave state of the finances of the country. The Finance Minister has been compelled, through force of circumstances, to admit an immense deficit. We were given to understand, at the opening of the session, that this deficit would be met by a reduction in the expenditure, and the adoption of a vigorous system of economy. That certainly was an idea which should meet the approval of the whole community, and I was rather in hopes that the Finance Minister would be able to make good that contention: but I find that, instead of adopting any such measure for meeting this bad state of affairs, he resorts to the same old method of putting on more protection in the shape of higher duty. So far as the increased duty upon sugar is concerned, it is quite evident that very little benefit has accrued to the treasury up to the present time. It has been reported—I will not vouch for the accuracy of the statement—that the refiners had a tip as to what was to be done. The results would seem to justify such a statement, because we find that large quantities of raw sugar were brought in just a few days prior to the time when the duties were to take effect. The saving to the refiners upon recent shipments would be no less a sum than \$350,000. The hon. member for South Oxford says that it would amount to a good deal more, and I should think it quite likely. How will the tax upon sugar affect the consumers of this country? Say that the people of Canada consume, in round numbers, 350,000,000 pounds a year. The duty now levied is at the rate of 1·14 cents per pound. The tax, at this rate, would amount, in round numbers, to \$4,000,000. That means this amount will be taken out of the consumers in Canada. And how will this great sum be divided? About \$1,750,000 will find its way into the treasury through the customs officials, and about \$2,250,000 will go into the pockets of the refiners. This is the way the hon. gentleman proposes to meet the growing expenses of the country. There is no doubt that retrenchment can be effected in nearly every department. There is no very important work at present in view necessitating a large outlay beyond the ordinary revenues of the country, and it seems that by inaugurating a system of economy and carrying it out vigorously—not a vigorous system of economy allowed to lie in a pigeon-hole, but the application of business methods to the management of the business affairs of the country—the necessary equilibrium between revenue and expenditure could be restored without resorting to any system of taxation, and without adding new burdens to those already borne by the people of the country. This system of protection by means of high taxation is said to be intended to develop the resources of the country—the natural resources, I presume. I

Mr RIDER.

will trouble you with a table, showing the amount of taxes collected on a few articles that are not produced in this country, and which are necessary articles, articles in use in every-day life. I have taken these figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ending 30th June, 1894:

Baking powder.....	\$ 31,941
Yeast	13,088
Mustard	16,931
Spices	23,352
Currants, dried.....	64,552
Prunes, dried.....	23,934
Figs and dates.....	19,365
Raisins	141,832
Tea and coffee.....	27,528
Rice	76,942
Sugar and molasses.....	100,175
Dairy salt.....	11,385
Packages for salt.....	2,025
Cocoa, cocoa nuts, and other nuts.....	156,768
Peaches	18,809
Grapes	29,375
Oranges and lemons.....	95,409
White and decorated stone table-ware...	210,324
Table cutlery.....	61,149
Total.....	\$1,125,815

This is evidence, Mr. Speaker, that this policy of protection by high taxation is not entirely for the purpose of developing the natural resources of the country, but is for the purpose of extracting money from the pockets of the people that will enable the occupants of the treasury benches to keep themselves in power. Now, to hear the hon. gentlemen opposite in their election tours, you would be led to believe that they were very solicitous for the welfare of the farming community of the country. But their treatment of this class indicates that it is their votes they care for more than their welfare; and I am surprised at the success hon. gentlemen opposite have been able to achieve while maintaining such a wide divergence between promise and performance. In looking over the tariff passed at the last session, a few items specially attract my attention. I will refer to one—fence wire, plain, annealed-oiled and annealed, and galvanized. That is an article upon which the manufacturers have a very high protection. Now, I am not one of those who believe that the manufacturers are robbers and thieves; and I do not think that I have ever heard any hon. gentleman on this side of the House denounce them as such. I have often had the pleasure of listening to the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny). This is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has incorporated in his speech the allegations that gentlemen on this side of the House speak of the manufacturers as thieves and robbers, for I have heard him say that every session since I first had the honour of a seat in this House. I might congratulate the hon. member upon his improved delivery of that part of his speech, but that is as far as I could go.