

farmers of this country when they advocate a tariff for revenue only, or a tariff from which every vestige of protection has been taken: You have too much protection on your oats, on your pork, on your beef, on your butter, and on your cheese under the National Policy. We are in favour of a tariff for revenue only, for free trade as it is in England, of a tariff from which every vestige of protection is taken. The Liberal-Conservative party now give the markets of our own country to our own people under the present tariff, and we shall stand or fall by it. I would ask these hon. gentlemen, I would ask the people of this country, if a tariff from which every vestige of protection is taken, will establish a new cheese factory in this country, or a new creamery? Will it cause a new mill to be built? Will it give work to an additional workman? Will it bring a new customer to a merchant's store? Will it help any one to earn a dollar? No, Mr. Speaker, I contend, on the contrary, that it will take wages from the people, it will take trade from the people, it will take a home market from the people, it will take trade from the merchants; and if hon. gentlemen opposite carry their policy to its proper conclusion, it will take from the farmer the protection that he enjoys from a paternal government, who looks after his interests by the establishment of experimental farms, creameries, dairies, and so forth. The Liberals declare that a tariff for revenue only will increase the importations of manufactured goods; but it will be to the displacement, of course, of those that are manufactured in our own country. How will this benefit the Canadian workman? How will this benefit the Canadian wage-earner? How will this benefit the farmer? A policy that brings in the manufactured goods of another country to the displacement of those that are manufactured in our own country, will close up the factories in our own country, and will deprive the farmer of the home market, will deprive the wage-earner of the employment which is now given by the manufacturers in this country. Now, Sir, let us consider the tariff in force in 1878 under a Liberal Administration, and see how it affected the taxation of the people. We find that between 1882 and 1894, inclusive, the Government of this country took off duties on tea amounting to \$10,053,697; they took off duties on coffee amounting to \$478,827; they took off duties on coal amounting to \$4,058,808; on tin, amounting to \$1,152,025; on sugar (1892), \$4,500,000; on billstamps, \$1,845,000; on newspapers, \$685,000; amounting, altogether, to \$23,773,357, which was taken off the tax-payers of the country on these items between 1882 and 1894. The Liberals say that we have increased the taxation of the country since 1878 by \$14,000,000 per year. Let us inquire for a moment if that is the case. The revenue collected dur-

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.)

ing the last year of Liberal rule was \$22,375,000; the amount of revenue collected in 1894 was \$36,375,000, showing an augmentation of 60 per cent, or \$14,000,000. Now, the Opposition try to make the people believe that this is increased taxation, although nothing could be further from the truth. One third of this \$14,000,000 is received from railways and canals, interest on investments, patent fees, public lands, &c. From this source there was derived in 1894, \$8,795,000; from the same source there was derived, in 1878, under Liberal rule, \$4,533,000. Therefore, we have gained, from this same source, over \$4,000,000, not a cent of which constitutes increased taxation. In 1878 the taxation within the country under Liberal rule, on liquors and tobaccos was \$4,858,600; in 1894 the same taxes yielded \$8,381,000. Here, again, on these articles we have a gain of over \$3,500,000. I am sure this is a taxation that meets with universal favour. We can consider this subject from two or three standpoints. The actual amount of customs collections in 1878 was \$12,782,800; in 1894 it was \$19,198,100; or a difference of \$6,415,300. It is important to observe here, in the first place, that this larger revenue does not by any means imply a corresponding increase of taxation. The percentage of duty on the total value of goods entered for consumption in 1878, was 14.3. If the same rate were applied to the total importations of 1894, it would have produced, on \$113,093,983 worth of importations, a revenue of \$15,867,085, or within \$3,331,000 of the sum actually collected. The simple fact is, therefore, that instead of the taxation being increased \$14,000,000 annually since 1878, it has not been increased one-fourth of that sum. Let me show you now, the way our taxes are levied at present, as compared with the manner in which they were levied in 1878. My contention is that any increase in taxation has been put upon the luxuries imported into this country and not on the necessaries of life, as will appear by the following table, showing the amounts collected in 1878 and 1894, respectively:—

| | 1878 | 1894 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Ales and porter | \$ 43,863 | \$ 65,061 |
| Spirits | 1,000,864 | 2,086,559 |
| Wines | 207,566 | 309,339 |
| Tobacco | 188,550 | 287,703 |
| Patent medicines | 29,744 | 62,973 |
| Perfumery | 5,953 | 10,280 |
| Playing cards | 4,014 | 10,913 |
| Plate glass | 14,467 | 66,668 |
| Gold and silver manuf'ers. | 41,476 | 79,418 |
| Silks and satins | 240,669 | 743,402 |
| Jewellery | 46,404 | 51,124 |
| Totals | \$1,829,570 | \$3,772,540 |

On the articles I have named, it will, therefore, be seen that the Government collected customs duties, in 1894, of more than double the amount that they obtained in 1878. These articles are practically all luxuries. While we are sorry, of course, to see a