

ple came and asked that there should be some protection for the farmer, and that he had to promise it to them, and that if the promise was not carried out he must resign his seat. Still the hon. gentleman occupies his seat. There is another, and I am sure he is not the least among the members on the other side of this House. I refer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Why, Sir, he looked upon protection as having something like a divine origin. He declared his belief in protection to a certain extent, and within certain limits. He said :

We have been told that a protective policy is one which could only be adopted by a patriarchal government—a government which could not only protect industries, but also limit production. I hold that a protective policy, on the contrary, runs through the whole legislative system of any country. To afford protection of life and property is the duty of government, and armies are raised and navies built to protect the nation. Prisons are erected for the protection of the public, and free grants given for the purpose of increasing the public wealth and adding to the population.

And he goes on to say, further :

It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufacture without having in the course of its history imposed exactions and restrictions. This has been notably the case with Great Britain herself ; and I think the assertion, that the development of various industries is necessary to the cultivation of the self-defensive power of a nation, is incontrovertible.

And, Sir, the speech that the hon. gentleman delivered upon that occasion, I think, is well worth reading ; and, although I have often heard him explain it, and make other addresses or speeches in the House, I must say that I prefer the one that he delivered on the 29th February, 1876. I do not think he need hope to explain the speech away or to improve upon it. Now, we are constantly reminded of Great Britain and her free trade. Great Britain is in a far different position from that we occupy. They have their coal, their iron, their limestone, and other materials of manufacture in the country, and in close proximity. They can manufacture to-day cheaper than any country in the world. But they have to import very largely everything that they consume other than manufactured goods. Their bread must be brought into the country, as also must their meat. Is it any wonder they made these things free ? The farmers are a small class compared with the industrial classes in Great Britain, and their influence is as nothing in comparison with that of manufacturers, artisans, and non-producers. If I were a non-producer in Great Britain, I believe nothing would induce me to favour the levying of a duty upon those articles that cannot be produced in the country. They have a large population in Great Britain—from end to end we may call it

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria).

one great city. The farming class is comparatively small, and probably will not be able to exert the influence to secure legislation, to impose duties upon breadstuffs. We are often told of free trade as it is in Great Britain. The customs taxes upon articles are very limited in number, but when they do put on a duty it is a pretty stiff one. We find that every pound of tea is taxed 7 cents. Tobacco, containing ten pounds of moisture is taxed 3s. and 2d., and if it contains less than that it is taxed 3s. and 6d. And on some kinds of tobacco and snuff, the tax is as high as 4s., and even 4s. and 6d. Now, the articles are very limited in number, but from them they raise a tax of about \$100,000,000 a year. But in other respects, the taxes cover a great variety of articles. You cannot give a receipt there that can be produced in court without having it stamped. A man's promissory note would be no good unless it were stamped ; his draft would have to be stamped. Any agreement, in order to make it valid, must have a stamp. Every mortgage, every transfer of land, every legacy requires a stamp. Every lawyer who is admitted there has to pay into the treasury of Great Britain the sum of \$250. A solicitor pays \$125 ; a doctor, \$150 ; a fellow or physician, \$125 ; notary public, \$150. On any agreement, or memorandum of agreement, not under seal, one has to pay 10 cents. Then we come to other articles, such as carriages. Any man who owns a carriage must pay 15s. a year—that is for a two-wheeled carriage. If it is a four-wheeled carriage, the owner must pay £2 2s. if for two horses, and £1 1s. if for one horse. Every man who owns a house must pay a tax. If the rental is £40 net, and not over £60, the tax is 4d. in the pound. If the rental exceeds £60, the tax is 6d. in the pound. Besides, there is a large amount collected on income. We know that there is a large amount of wealth in Great Britain. If the same taxes upon income were imposed here, we would find that they would yield but a small revenue. Public houses, restaurants, and beer shops are taxed, the tax increasing according to the number of hours they are kept open. If they are kept open on Sunday, the tax is very much increased. Another argument that is used here is the large amount of money that is made out of the different industries in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, any person can ascertain the amount of money in these industries by applying to get stock in the company carrying it on. I shall just read a few of the quotations. I may say, first, with regard to the sugar industry of this country, that not long ago, for every \$100 invested in these refineries, no person would offer more than \$55, and I believe that the highest quotation lately is about \$85. Now, Sir, the Dominion Cotton Company's bonds are sold at par. The Dominion Cotton Company's stock, buyers will only give 98,