

sides. It was most clearly set forth, I think, in the language of the hon. leader of the Opposition, speaking in Winnipeg, on the 3rd September, 1894, where he laid down his policy in the following words—and I take the precaution of quoting from the "Globe," the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite freedom of trade as it is practised in Great Britain. This is the policy we adopt:

As soon as we shall have a Liberal Administration in Ottawa—and I think we shall have one before very long, although it is not for me to say when—there can be a very radical alteration of affairs looked for. We shall give you freer trade, and, although it will be a hard fight, we shall not give in one inch or retrace our steps until we shall have reached the goal, and that goal is the same policy of free trade as exists in England to-day.

To make up the deficit which will arise, it will be necessary to get an addition from some other sources.

That is the policy of the leader of the Opposition, and that is the policy upon which hon. gentlemen opposite are standing to-day—free trade as it exists in England at present, with a revenue tariff as collected in England. This was also laid down by the leader of the Opposition in what was known as the Massey-Hall meeting, Toronto, where he expressed himself as a Liberal of the English school. With all the loyalty we may feel for the institutions of the old country, the means of raising revenue adopted in Great Britain are not at all applicable to this country. This is where we must take one of our greatest issues with hon. gentlemen opposite. If we adopt the policy of free trade as it exists in England, then we adopt the means which Great Britain takes of raising a revenue. The one part of the policy involves the other. That is what the leader of the Opposition, I take it, meant when he said at Winnipeg that to make up the deficit it will be necessary to get an addition from other sources. Now, they have never gone into detail, and it is only fair to the country that we should be taken more into the confidence of the hon. gentlemen. When they profess they have a panacea for the alleged woes of this country, they ought to give it out to the country; they ought to scatter it far and wide; they ought not to deal in generalities, but should come down to the practical details so that every constituency in the country will be able to see and understand. They have not done so because the question of revenue is an exceedingly ugly one. They talk about their economies, they talk one thing and another, but they all know that they have to raise a revenue. They know that the affairs of this country cannot be carried on without a revenue. We have already fixed charges upon our revenue amounting to \$16,000,000 a year, or thereabouts, and they would have from \$18,000,000 to \$20,000,000 to work upon. In all their propositions of economy, they do not

Mr. COATSWORTH.

propose to economize to the extent of more than a million or two; and even if they did that, they would still have a revenue of \$35,000,000 to raise. This must be obtained, according to the proposition of the hon. gentleman, in the same way that revenue is raised in Great Britain, and I presume it can hardly be raised in any other way. We give the British people, and I think, rightly, credit for a great deal of discretion and business judgment, and it is quite impossible to conceive that they would not have the best possible way of collecting revenue under the free trade system which they have adopted. But I ask the question: Is the British method of raising revenue possible in Canada? And I answer it in this way: We will find, even upon the most superficial analysis of revenue, as it is raised in Great Britain, that it would be simply an impossibility for us to raise revenue in the same manner in this country, because we would be robbing every municipality and every province in the Dominion of a large proportion of their present revenue, and we would place on the people a burden of direct taxation which they could not possibly bear. Now, the items of the British revenue are not very numerous, and I would just like to refer to them for the purpose of calling the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the position in which their own policy places them. The revenue derived in the mother country during the years 1893-94 amounted to £90,375,000. This revenue was derived from customs, excise, stamp and land tax, house duty, property and income tax, post office, telegraph service, crown lands, and miscellaneous items of revenue. It is not proposed by the hon. gentleman to abandon altogether the customs revenue; and I presume that if they adopt free trade as it is in England, as one of the hon. gentlemen said the other night, they would not be bound by the veriest details or revenue as it is in the old country. At the same time, we must assume that they are substantially bound by the principles of raising the public revenue, and the main items of that system in use in the old country. For instance, we place a tax upon carriages. But the hon. gentleman cannot adopt that tax and yet have free trade as it is in Great Britain, because there is no tax on carriages in that country. So I might go on with a long list of items to show that hon. gentlemen must practically adopt, on the whole, the tariff of revenue as it is in Great Britain if they are to adopt, as the leader of the Opposition says, free trade as it is in England to-day. The customs revenue in Great Britain is raised from beer, chicory, cocoa, coffee, currants, raisins, spirits, tea, tobacco, snuff and wine. Now, the hon. gentlemen pretend that they are going to take the duties off the necessities of life. That is one of the sprats they offer to the electors in this country,