

figures ; they took me some time to prepare and collate in order to insure their accuracy. They point a moral and adorn a tale, and if the people of the Dominion, while compelled to sell their goods at decreased prices, that is the goods which they export, their grain and other agricultural products which are sent into the markets of the world, are not allowed to benefit by buying cheap goods, then truly is their state most pitiable, they are being fleeced at both ends. If these figures which I have read prove the statements I have made, can any one wonder that people have been fleeing from Canada by hundreds of thousands during the last ten years ? Would not this justify them in leaving this country, great and glorious as this country is, and great and glorious as are its possibilities of development ? If this policy is to continue, if there is no help for the people except the slow rate of progress that has taken place during the past ten years, why should our young men remain here ? If young men on the farm find that the farm is being mortgaged, that it is becoming more heavily involved, are they justified in remaining here to drag along for another ten years instead of going away to better their fortunes abroad ? No, you cannot blame any one. It will be in the future as it has been in the past, unless hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to recast their policy, or to go to the people, when they will recast it very speedily for them.

I say more than that. The great charge we bring against the National Policy is not so much the increased money it takes out of the people and puts into the treasury, not so much the fact either that it prevents the people from enjoying the benefits which flow from the purchase of cheap goods, but it is this fact, standing prominently above all others, and which is patent wherever a protective system exists—that you are taxing the people not only for revenue but for your protected interests. I was greatly disappointed when the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) spoke to-night, and I was disappointed with his speech in this view. I said : here is a practical man ; he challenges the accuracy of the statements made by the hon. member for South Oxford ; he is one of the protected industries of the country, for he owns such an industry himself ; he says that the statements of the hon. member for South Oxford are not correct, he denies them—now he is in a position to disprove them by facts—yet that hon. gentleman did not give us one fact to disprove them. Why did the hon. gentleman not take up the question of cotton, or iron, or cordage, or sugar, or any one of the numerous illustrations which the hon. member for South Oxford gave to prove his statement that you are taxing the people enormously not for the benefit of the treasury but for the pockets of the protected industries, and show that my hon. friend's statement is wrong ? The

hon. member for South Oxford did not deal in generalities ; he made a general statement first, and he illustrated it with a wealth of argument and profusion of illustration which was convincing to every open mind that listened to him. If his facts were incorrect, if his illustrations were wrong, who was in a better position to correct them than the hon. member for Lanark himself ? Did he, in the half hour's speech which he delivered to the House, challenge the accuracy, in any one detail, of the figures which the hon. member for South Oxford gave to prove the general statement he made as to the enormous sum of money that is being wrung out of the people in the shape of taxes, not one dollar of which goes into the treasury ?

Take the subject of cordage, to which I have referred, and in which the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) is largely interested, a question which specially affects the interests of that part of the Dominion from which I come ; and I ask the hon. member if that is not a case in point where under a protective policy the manufacturers fleece the people without paying a dollar into the treasury ? How much taxes do you levy ? The customs tax is one cent and a quarter per pound, and 10 per cent ad valorem, equal to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  cents per pound. How much does that give us in the treasury ? Almost nothing. In 1894, there was \$18,000 collected on cordage of all kinds, the quantity being 776,000 pounds. There was not a dollar paid into the treasury on rope. The monopoly in rope is complete, so much so, that the protective system, so far as rope is concerned, has been carried to its logical conclusion and foreign rope is excluded absolutely from this market. With what result ? With the result that the cordage combine controls the market and the extent of the tariff represents the amount which the consumers of cordage will pay for their cordage in this country. In other words, he will pay  $2\frac{1}{2}$  cents per pound more than if the duty was not there. Every dollar of this tax goes into the pockets of the cordage combine. This combine goes down into Newfoundland, where it has to compete with English and American manufacturers, and there the combine sells cordage at  $1\frac{3}{4}$  or 2 cents per pound less than to Canadian consumers. So the people are being fleeced and mulcted in this enormous sum, not for the benefit of this country or its treasury, but with the result that the fishermen of Newfoundland, who fish against our fishermen, are able to obtain their cordage under our protective policy 2 cents per pound cheaper than can our own fishermen. Why did not the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) say something about the cotton mills ? We have heard a great deal about the cotton mills and the capital invested in them. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) gave the House a statement so far as regards some of the mills in his section, and the effect of protective