

if we are to judge by last year's exports of our highly protected cotton combine, because I find that they sent just \$8 worth of cotton goods to the whole of Australia. Whatever goods we do send to Australia will be agricultural implements and machinery, on which our people have to pay the full tax under the National Policy, while it will all be taken off to enable the Australians to get cheaper machinery than our own people. Now, what does Australia send to us? Everybody knows that it is a great wool-producing and mutton-producing country. Let us look at the goods we got from Australia last year. They do not amount to very much; but the chief imports I will mention. We got \$6,250 worth of green apples. Now, we raise apples in Canada, and we consider them pretty good ones. We imported from Australia, also, 59,000 pounds of butter, valued at \$10,421. I do not think we need to bring butter into Canada from Australia, and to subsidize steamers in order to do so. Of lard, bacon, salt beef, &c., we brought in \$1,300 worth, and we brought in 61,200 pounds of mutton, valued at \$1,797. I think it will be admitted by all hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that these are not articles which we should spend money in order to bring into Canada; and yet these are the chief imports that came to us last year from Australia. Now, how does the National Policy protect the farmer in the matter of wool? It carefully puts a duty on such wool as we produce a surplus of in Canada; but it does not charge one farthing upon the wool which the Australians send into Canada; that comes in free. Now, what does the Dominion Grange think of this attempt to promote trade with Australia? Hon. gentlemen opposite sneered a little while ago at the name of the Patrons of Industry, when they were mentioned in this House; let them sneer at the Dominion Grange. I can only say that that organization was brought into existence because of the pressure of circumstances that drove together men who felt that they were being unfairly treated under the policy of the Government; and what do they say? This is not the history of seventeen years ago, but the history of to-day, dealing with the live issues of the moment:

We desire to enter our most strenuous protest against subsidizing a line of steamships to Australia. As the products of that country are similar to the agricultural products of Canada, but are produced at a very much less cost, this would be a blow at our home market, and taxing ourselves to destroy our interests.

I think the majority of thinking men will say that is a fair estimate of the efforts the Government are making to develop trade by taking money out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers to subsidize lines of steamships to bring into Canada goods to compete with the products of our own peo-

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

ple of which we have already a surplus. Under these circumstances, it would be a wonder if organizations of this kind had not grown up in our midst, and if they did not feel that the pressure was more than they were willing to endure.

But, Sir, I want, for a moment to glance at the process by which the Government are now working out the details of the National Policy. They told us that they proposed to tax the goods of those people who want to find their way into the Canadian market, and they proposed to do this for the purpose of keeping Canada for the Canadians. That might have been true some years ago. Is it true to-day? What is the history of the changes of taxation as developed under the administration of the present Government? Let us look for a moment at the mode in which they have developed our taxation. When the Finance Minister first entered on his office this is the statement which he made on the 27th March, 1890:

I stated last year, that, looking at the condition of the country and looking at the munificent contributions which have been given by this country for her public works—it seems to me that we ought not, after the close of the year 1889, to increase the public debt. That we ought not to increase the public expenditure for ordinary purposes, and that it was possible to meet the capital obligations we had already assumed, and to go to the year 1892 without adding to our net debt. After that we might consider whether or not we could not gradually decrease the debt which we have assumed and placed on ourselves.

He was then referring to the year 1889, and he repeated and emphasized that statement. He said:

Now, Sir, I am here to-day, one year after the time of making that statement, to affirm with equal truth to-day, \$36,500,000 of ordinary expenditure from our Consolidated Revenue Fund is sufficient to carry our debt, pay our interest, pay all our ordinary expenditures, and leave \$2,000,000 in the hands of the Minister of Public Works each year to build new and necessary public works.

To carry her present burdens Canada is amply sufficient, but for any further increase I believe good reasons are demanded and good reasons must be given.

Did he confine the expenditure to that \$36,500,000? Look at the Estimates for 1895 of \$38,517,000 and judge for yourself.

He boasts to us of the expenditure made on our public works. Look, he said, at our railways, at our canals, see the development of our resources by these means. What are the returns that they present to us? The expenditure on these public works was somewhere about \$149,000,000, as the hon. gentleman correctly stated. On the Intercolonial, the expenditure was \$44,966,424. On our canals the expenditure was \$44,709,038; on the Canadian Pacific Railway our expenditure on capital amounted to \$62,601,535, making altogether \$149,000,000. Now, these are in the investments about which the hon.