

articles used by the rich is the duty above the average, while on those used by the poor it ranges all the way up to 100 per cent above the average. In the face of these facts and figures, taken from documents furnished by the Government itself, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of this House, and I ask the country, is there not discrimination against the poor and in favour of the rich? But that is not all. Let us look at the rich man's tariff: Silk fabrics, 30 per cent; silk laces, 30 per cent; precious stones, 10 per cent; oil and water colour paintings, by eminent artists to adorn the walls of the rich, free; but if the poor man wants a few steel plates or anything of that kind he has to pay 30 per cent. A member of this House bought a painting in New York for \$46,000, brought it home to Montreal to adorn his palace, and brought it in free of duty; but if I want to buy a picture in accordance with my limited capacity for buying, I have to pay 30 per cent of its value before I can bring it in. Is that not discrimination in favour of the rich? The best carpets which can be purchased in this country are charged 30 per cent; silk velvets, 30 per cent; jewellery, 20 per cent; manufactures of gold, 20 per cent; china and porcelain ware, 30 per cent; fur coats and cloaks to keep the rich warm, which the poor cannot buy, 25 per cent. In this list there is not one single article on which the duty is above the average. In the face of these figures I ask this House, and through the press, I ask the country, are they willing to retain in power a Government which thus places a burden on the poor and favours the rich? The situation is correctly described by a little triplet which I found the other day in the New York 'Daily America.' Listen to it:

"Yes, the tariff is a tax,
And the poor people get it
Where the chicken got the axe."

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not all that can be said against protection. It is such an abomination of iniquities that a person could hardly get through telling of them in a week. Protection distributes unequally the wealth of a nation, and the labouring classes, in whose favour it is said to be, have not at command at any time enough to carry them over a few months' stringency in the labour market. Twenty-five thousand people of the United States have more money and property within their grasp than the balance of the sixty-five millions. Is that a proper distribution of the wealth of the nation? I will show you that protection brings about that inequality. Three-fifths of the wealth of the United States is congested in the nine North-eastern States, the great manufacturing States of the Union. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to place before you and the House figures which go to prove my contention that protection distributes unequally the wealth of a country. In 1860 the farm

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

values of the United States were \$7,989,000,000. In 1880, after twenty years' protection these values had risen to \$12,140,000,000, or an increase of 52 per cent. Now, other values amounted in 1860 to \$8,180,000,000, and in 1880, twenty years afterwards, they had risen to \$31,538,000,000, or an increase of 280 per cent. But, Sir, there are other figures which I wish to give you, taken from the compendium of the United States census of 1880, at page 926, so that any hon. member can verify them for himself. The amount invested in farm property in 1880 in the United States was \$12,104,000,000; the value of the products was \$2,790,000,000; the persons employed were 7,670,400; the product per hand was \$288. The value of farm labour at that time was \$270, so that the farmer had \$18 profit on each hand he employed. That was the farmer's side of the matter. Now take the manufacturer's side. In 1880 the amount invested in manufacturing industries in the United States was \$2,791,000,000; the value of the product was \$5,370,000,000; the cost of material was \$3,370,000,000; the value of the product, less material, was \$1,973,000,000; the persons employed numbered 2,732,000; and the product per head was \$721. Now, the average wages paid in the factories of the United States was \$325, leaving a profit to the manufacturer of nearly \$400 on every hand employed, while the farmer had a profit of only \$18 on each hand employed by him. That shows beyond any doubt that the farmer is not getting fair play under protection; and if it were possible to give similar figures in regard to this Canada of ours, they would show exactly the same results in principle. But there is another evil in protection. Protection is at least one of the causes of the depreciation of the value of farm lands. We are told every day that the farmers are getting better off. Now, it is no use talking arrant nonsense; it is no use trying to deceive the people; because they know that they are not getting better off. I will give you a few figures which will show you to a demonstration that they are not as well off as they were a few years ago. The average value of farm lands in Ontario for the ten years from 1882 to 1892, was \$632,500,000. In 1891, the value was \$621,250,000, or 11¼ millions less. Do you really suppose, Sir, that the farmers of this country in selling out their lands in 1891, and getting 11¼ millions less for their property, were equally wealthy as if they had sold at the higher rate? Worse than that, in 1892, the value of the land was \$616,000,000, or \$16,500,000 less than the average from 1882 to 1892. It is estimated that we have 250,000 farms in Ontario, so that, dividing the land equally, the value of each farm would show a reduction of \$660 in 1892, as compared with the average value during the decade. But that is not all. Let me quote this statement from the Bureau of Industry Report