

Then we find lamp chimneys, 30 per cent ; churns, wood, 20 per cent ; china and porcelain ware, 30 per cent ; clothes wringers, 25 per cent ; cordage, $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound, and 10 per cent. Now, this revenue which they collect upon cordage does not actually go into the treasury, because we import no cordage. We have two or three cordage industries amalgamated into one ; they are able to manufacture all the country needs, and being protected by a high duty of $1\frac{1}{2}$ or 2 cents per pound, no person can import it. We give the manufacturer of that cordage the benefit of the duty, which does not go into the treasury, but goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. Collars, cotton and linen, 24 cents per dozen, and 25 per cent. Now, will the Minister tell me that the poor people do not wear collars or cuffs ? Cuffs, 4 cents per pair, and 25 per cent ; cultivators, $32\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ; curry combs, $32\frac{1}{2}$ per cent—for the curry comb that curry the old horses that hon. gentlemen opposite were riding a few years ago. Table cutlery, not plated, $32\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ; duck, cotton, printed, dyed or coloured, 30 per cent ; earthenware, 35 per cent ; drain tiles, 20 per cent ; edged tools, 35 per cent ; fanning mills, 35 per cent ; flour, 75 cents per barrel. I am afraid we shall have to ask the Government to take the duty off flour. Barbed wire fencing, iron or steel, $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent per pound ; flags, cotton or bunting, 30 per cent. Just fancy a tax of 30 per cent on the old flag. Now, if I had my way I would admit that duty free, but these disloyal hon. gentlemen opposite tax the old flag. Mirrors, $27\frac{1}{2}$ to 32 per cent. Well, I suppose poor people must do without mirrors. Grindstones, 25 per cent ; hammers, 25 per cent. Now, we can see from these items what sort of protection the poor farmers are getting under this National Policy. To speak seriously, we must admit that it is high time a change should take place. It is high time that these hon. gentlemen, if they intend to hold on to the reins of Government much longer, should begin to show by their actions that they intend to legislate for the welfare of the people at large. The policy of this Government tends to make 10 per cent of the population millionaires, and to starve the other 90 per cent. Sir, what proportion of the population of this country are the manufacturers compared with the farmers, the workingmen, and the artisans ? They are just about 10 per cent as compared with 90 per cent, and the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is to benefit the 10 per cent at the expense of the 90. It is time the people should understand these things, and I believe they do understand them. I believe the people are only waiting for the year, for the month, for the week, for the day, for the hour, when they will have an opportunity of going to the polls and sending these gentlemen into the shades of oblivion. Sir, I believe the people are beginning to see that this Government have

Mr. PERRY.

been squandering millions of their hard-earned money. How hon. gentlemen opposite can afford to look hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in the face, and stand these charges without ever a blush, is what I cannot understand. Why, Sir, the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) referred to Mr. Mackenzie's letter wherein that gentleman said that he was bound to protect the treasury. He meant by that, I suppose, that he was bound to see that every dollar extracted from the people in the shape of taxes, was properly expended for the legitimate interests of the country. And, Sir when he left office he had protected the treasury, he had saved the treasury. But unfortunately for this country, so many booblers subsequently came around that they took all there was in the treasury, and taxed the people 75 per cent more than they were taxed under the Mackenzie regime. And what is the result of all their taxation ? Why, Sir, last year they had over a million dollars deficit, and this year they have five million. It was hard dragging it out of the Minister of Finance, he called it four and a half, but I call it five ; and I am afraid that before the next session it will be six millions. What kind of a showing is that ? Notwithstanding that we are taxed at the rate of \$40,000,000 a year, in place of the \$23,500,000 in 1878-79, notwithstanding all that, we have an expenditure over estimates of more than a million dollars, with a deficit of over five millions. What is the reason of this deficit ? Will hon. gentlemen tell me that there has been a war during the last year ? Were there any great public works ? Was the Canadian Pacific Railway building ? Was the tunnel building ? Was the Southern Branch Railway building in Prince Edward Island ? How can they account for the mismanagement which has produced a deficit of five or six millions ? During the last year the national debt of this country has increased over seven million dollars, if you can rely upon the blue-book. Take up the Auditor General's Report, and what do you find ? You can hardly turn two pages, one after another, but you find war between the Government and the Auditor General. The Auditor General refuses to pay certain accounts. How is he prepared to pay that \$2,500,000 which the Government have passed an Order in Council to give as a bonus to the Hudson Bay Railway Company ? How are they going to get over that ? They expect to get a vote from this House to back up their Order in Council. Will they get it ? I am sure they won't get it on this side of the House ; if they do, I will leave my party, I will not belong to them one minute longer. This is the way things are mismanaged, this is the way things are muddled, and no wonder the deficit is there. No wonder the debt has increased over seven millions during the last year. One would think that, within the