

New South Wales 5 per cent. during the last two years. I come now to another point, namely, the predicted increase of taxation upon the consumer. It was stated in 1879 by hon. gentlemen opposite, and repeated last year as well as during the recess, that the effect of this tariff was to add to the taxation of the people of Canada a sum of \$7,000,000, while only \$2,000,000 would be paid into the public treasury. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how that could possibly be? I put the question not only to him but to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. If, say, our imports have been diminished by \$6,000,000, add this to the \$71,000,000 which represents the amount entered for consumption last year, and we have \$77,000,000 as the amount representing our importations if we had not manufactured a certain quantity of goods at home. The average tariff for the last year has been 20 per cent., or one-fifth, which, upon the \$71,000,000 is a sum of about \$14,000,000; the additional duty upon the \$6,000,000 (which we will estimate represents the reduction of imports) would be, if the goods had been imported instead of being made in this country, \$1,200,000 instead of the \$5,000,000 which the hon. gentleman named. But when I point to agricultural implements, a large portion of the cotton and woollen goods, a large portion of the iron manufactures, and many other articles with regard to which hon. gentlemen say the tariff is not popular, because it has increased the price of the raw material and not increased the price to the consumer, then I say but a very small portion of the \$1,200,000 is paid by the people of this country as a result of the change in the tariff. But as to the contention of my predecessor (Sir Richard Cartwright) that a tax of \$7,000,000 is imposed upon the people, and that \$2,000,000 only goes into the Treasury, I confess I cannot understand it, and I hope that the hon. gentleman will so explain it that it may be understood by the House and by the country.

Mr. PLUMB — They tried to explain it in West Toronto last summer.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY — Another objection to the tariff was that it would break up the Union by distributing the taxation of the country unequally on the various provinces. In the language of my hon. friend from Centre Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), the smaller provinces would pay a much larger sum proportionately than