

to call themselves. The excise taxes are enormous, the stamp, which pervades almost every department and every transaction here from the huxter's shop to the Court of Chancery, is something dreadful. You can scarcely carry out any transaction, except the very pettiest, without the presence of the stamp. In law proceedings the cost on this account alone is frightful. The death duties are simply confiscation, the income tax, which is not to be evaded, is a government and not a municipal tax, is 8d. in the pound, and applies to every cent you receive as interest or otherwise. So I could go on to endeavour to show that the prodigious revenue of England has to be paid by methods far more galling and exasperating than if to a large extent collected from customs, while the expenditure is prodigal in everything that goes to sustain caste, beyond that of any other country. The "Globe's" picture of free trade England is a very different affair from the actual one.

That, Sir, is the experience of a returned Canadian. Now, with reference to the economy that hon. gentlemen propose to practice, I would like to say a few words before I sit down. They say they propose to economize the public expenditure. Now, there are three or four things that go to prove that they will not and cannot economize in public expenditure. In the first place, we have to be governed in our judgment of them to a large extent by their former performances. When they were a few years in power, they ran up the expenditure at once several millions, and I claim they would do the same thing again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You had better look at the figures.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I think the hon. gentleman has looked at the figures until his eyes are sore, and I do not think he has changed them any. The hon. gentleman knows that the figures increased very largely and I think he feels they would be bound to increase again. In the next place, we must remember that their friends the Liberal provincial governments recently met in an inter-provincial conference and demanded additional subsidies; so that the moment hon. gentlemen get into power there would be a general demand from all the Liberal provincial governments for increased subsidies, a demand which, I believe, in view of the aid and assistance that these Liberal governments are preparing to give them, would be almost if not entirely irresistible. In fact, it is said that the hon. gentlemen opposite, before the last election, were committed to the increase of the provincial subsidies in case of their success at the polls. In the next place, if I might use again the expression of my hon. friend who preceded me, they have the hungry Grit to reckon with; and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that that individual is not confined to any particular place in Canada. He may be found all over the country, and there would be a demand for place and position such as led the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie to state, in that remarkable letter, that during his Adminis-

Mr. COATSWORTH.

tration he had literally to stand by the door of the treasury with a loaded revolver in his hand to keep his friends from robbing it. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have the same demand for place and position, and there would be a far greater number of men demanding to fill those places, so that I feel assured that hon. gentlemen opposite, even with the best intentions, would be quite unable to resist that demand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Humanity has kept away the revolver for the past eight or ten years.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes, and the leader of the Opposition says they will be able to resist.

Mr. LAURIER. No; I said the men in power resisted very well.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes, and the hon. gentleman would be able to resist by keeping out of power. Then we have the example of the provincial Liberal governments. They have not been very economical; in fact, I believe that in Ontario the provincial government has been rather an extravagant one. I might refer to a good many items of expenditure which characterize that government, but I will simply mention one, because it is an illustration that comes home to us in this House. In the Ontario house they have 66 sessional clerks, while we have only 37 here. That shows how economical they would be; and I think if hon. gentlemen have the good fortune to get into power, and the country had the misfortune to see them in power, we would see the same thing pervading the whole system, and a Liberal Government would enter upon an era of extravagance such as we have never known in Canada before. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to talk about the extravagance of this Government; we would have the same thing repeated that we had in 1874, the expenditure of the country would go up to 40 or 45 millions, and there would be deficits every year. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this country are too well informed to think for one moment of allowing hon. gentlemen opposite to get into power.

Mr. PERRY. I desire to say a few words upon this all important question. We are discussing the ways and means by which the people may be taxed in order to keep up the expenditure and extravagance of the present Government, and it is a question which our constituents expect us to consider carefully. I intend to devote a few of my remarks to the speech delivered the other evening by my hon. friend from the county of King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Macdonald). He was good enough to say the other evening that the farmers of Canada, and more especially the farmers of Prince Edward Island, had protection under the National Policy. Well, I fail to see how they are protected, in fact, I think he must fail himself. We find that