

and the same with cattle and sheep and anything that is produced by the farmer and exported to the United States. Here is an item which to some will seem of very little importance, the item of eggs. That has grown to be an enormous trade in this country. In 1882-83 there were \$2,256,856 worth of eggs exported from this country. This last fiscal year the amount was only \$1,960,197, or a falling off of about 2,000,000 dozen of eggs during the last fiscal year. The farmers on that article alone lost during the last year about \$344,000 on duty. The hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth) stated the other night that the producer paid the duties on potatoes going into the Boston market. I quite agree with him that the producer pays the duty on potatoes and on everything sold in the American market. Where the market is established, when there is a duty between where it is produced and that market, he pays the duty on it. At the same moment he turned round and said that the producer paid the duty on coal in the same way. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) last night made nearly the same statement. The market for coal is established in the United States, and all expenses attached to that, after the market is established, are paid by the consumers in regard to coal. The Government received this last year \$1,316,381.90 in duty on coal. Who paid that to the Government? Was it the producer or the consumer? I claim it is plain enough to be seen that it is the consumer who pays that duty on coal—there is no question about it. This is what the farmers have got to suffer. They have lost during the last year over \$6,250,000 by protection. It is time they began to get their eyes open in this matter. I have an article here taken from the Jackson, Michigan, *Patriot*, which describes the views of the people in this country better than I can myself.

"Looking at the facts, setting all theories aside, we cannot discover wherein our farmers are benefited an iota in the price of their exportable commodities by protective taxation. The tariff has nothing whatever to do in fixing the price of articles of export. And of our total exports from 80 to 90 per cent. are the non-protected products of the soil.

"But, on the other hand, it is apparent that the net earnings of our farmers are very much reduced by the protective taxes they are compelled to pay on nearly everything they purchase for use and consumption.

"They sell their surplus in foreign markets where our tariff laws are inoperative in the matter of prices, and they buy what they require in the way of farm implements and household articles in the home market where the tariff is operative and is intended to keep prices far higher than they would be if there was no tariff.

"The price of their surplus wheat, provisions and cotton is determined every hour in Liverpool in competition with the producers of the world, while the price of much that they buy is determined by the cost in foreign markets, plus the percentage of protected taxation levied by our tariff laws.

"The claim that our farmers are enriched by protective taxation is the shammiest fraud in the whole category of frauds used to bolster up the fallacies and sophisms of protection.

"But, say the protectionists, build up home manufactures by the help of tariff taxes so as to have a home market for all the products of the soil. That is impossible. The farmers are producing 600 millions a year more products than the home market, after a hundred years of protection, can furnish a market for.

"In all leading industries our present capacity for producing manufactured goods exceeds our capacity for consumption. There is but one cry in all protected industries at present, and that is 'over-production.' The iron furnaces and mills, and woollen mills, the cotton mills, and the boot and shoe factories, the agricultural implement factories, the furniture factories, and other great industries are suffering for the lack of a market for their products.

"The trouble is not because we have too little, but because we have too much, and under the trade-restricting tariff system cannot sell to people of other countries, because we will not buy of them on equal terms such things as they have to dispose of.

"Trade is reciprocal, and protectionism is the enemy of reciprocal trade. People who desire to sell must be willing to buy, or else trade is impossible.

"Then, under our tariff system of placing taxes upon raw materials needed by our manufacturers, the cost of manufacturing is so increased that they cannot sell their products in competition with manufacturers who are not thus handicapped. The manufacturers of England, France and Germany are not burdened with tariff taxes levied by their respective Governments upon the raw materials they use.

"Placed at this great disadvantage our manufacturers cannot compete with them in the markets of the world. For this reason our leading

industries cannot increase much beyond merely supplying the demands of the home market.

"The only way to increase the home market for farm products is to strike down the tariff restrictions, which are an embargo upon trade, remove the burdensome tariff taxes from all raw materials, permit fair and free competition, and let the best men and nations win.

"Our unprotected farmers successfully compete with the cheapest labor in the markets of the world; and our manufacturers, we firmly believe, could do with equal success if the burdens of tariff taxation were removed and the restrictions imposed upon trade by our tariff laws were abolished."

Now, Sir, that is from a farmer's standpoint in the State of Michigan, and it touches our case in this country precisely. But, at the same time, the farmers in this country must understand that it will be impossible to reduce the taxes raised from duties down to what they were before, because the expenses of the Government are so great that the taxes will have to remain high for a long period of years. Although the effects are pointed out here, they are hard to be remedied; no matter what Government may be in power they cannot be remedied for a long time to come. Now, I want to say a word in regard to the bounties on pig iron. I claim that the Government have no right to take the people's money to bolster up any individual industry at the expense of the masses of the people. Any municipality, any corporation, has a perfect right to grant bonuses where they expect to receive some return in the way of advanced value to property, as in the case of a railway, or anything of that kind, where they expect to receive either direct or indirect advantage from it. But, when the Government takes money from the pockets of the people to bolster up any manufacturing industry, and which money has to be paid by the mass of people, I say it is decidedly wrong. Now, what are the facts? After all the assistance given by the Government the product of the pig iron industry has only amounted to 28,000 tons last year. A bounty of \$42,000 was given to the pig iron industry, and I claim it is a robbery of the people. Farmers, as a rule, have to pay for these things, and I claim it is entirely wrong. Now, Sir, I want to pay attention to the immigration policy. I find from the Auditor General's report for the year ended 30th June, 1884, that the total expenses for immigration purposes were \$511,208.83, and for quarantine \$64,117.89, making a total of \$575,326.72 paid for immigration and quarantine. I also find that \$142,138.82 were paid out for printing, advertising, &c. The first on the list in this line comes the Burland Lithographic Company, \$25,917.30; the next comes the Montreal *Gazette*, \$9,211.15; the London *Free Press*, \$6,075.60; the Toronto *Mail*, \$9,803.92. Now I might here mention that the Toronto *Mail* have denied that this amount of money was received by them for printing or publishing in any way; they claim that it was the *Mail* Printing Company that received the money. Well, this printing company and jobbing company, I understand, belongs to the Hamilton *Spectator*, and if it is taken from the Toronto *Mail* it must be given to the Hamilton *Spectator*. We find also the Hamilton *Spectator* credited for \$6,593.26; the Montreal *Minerve*, \$213; the Montreal *Herald*, \$2,767.20; the Montreal *Industrial World*, \$2,500; L. J. Demers et freres, \$2,322.42; J. J. Foote, Quebec, \$3,780.46; H. W. Bennett, Prescott, \$6,141.95; G. H. Taylor, Ottawa, \$1,600. I find MacLean, Roger & Co., of the city of Ottawa, Government Printers, received the enormous sum of \$34. There are numerous other smaller items that I will not mention, varying from \$3 to \$1,000. Now I find there is a charge for photographs. I am sorry the hon. First Minister is not in his seat, because I wanted to ask whether this was a photograph taken of himself and his colleagues in the Cabinet to be sent into foreign countries as an advertisement to induce immigrants to come to this country by their good looks, or whether it was a photograph of himself taken in his new G. C. B. costume given by the Queen, to be sent into foreign countries for the same purpose. We find there were expended for paper for pamphlets, \$27,660.79. I will