

to throw dust in the eyes of the people as to the incidence or amount of taxation, when your public accounts show that, whereas during the period from 1873 to 1878 we only levied about seventeen and a half millions per year of taxation, you have been levying, during the past seven or eight years, between twenty-seven and thirty millions. Not, mind you, for the private purposes of the protected manufacturer, but simply for the purposes of revenue. And this has brought about an era of unbridled extravagance. I remember well when, in this House, in 1881, the Conservative party—Tory party I like to call them, because that is what they are—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I see some of them like to be called that. It is not a term of reproach or ought not to be. A Tory is generally an honest man, not the hybrid who calls himself a Liberal-Conservative. We say that when they entered upon their carnival of extravagance in 1881, they began the system of fleecing the people, and taking millions of dollars per year more out of their pockets, to enable them to continue this system of extravagance, than ever was done under the Mackenzie tariff; and we condemn it on that ground. Protection always generates extravagance, I do not care where it is applied. Look at the result in the United States. They have taken so much revenue under their high tariff that at one time they did not know what to do with the money; and the whole country was engaged for years in trying to find out men whom they could pension to use the money up; and hundreds of millions of dollars are to this day being squandered in pensions to thousands of people who do not deserve it, and would not have got it, if that country had not this abominable system of protection in force. Again I say we condemn it because it taxes the people directly for the treasury ten million dollars per year more than they were taxed under the Mackenzie tariff. I have made a very careful calculation upon this point, and I say that between 1878 and 1895 you have taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada at least 80 millions of dollars more under your present tariff than you would have taken out if the Mackenzie tariff had been continued. Mark, I make no reference at all to the millions you have taken from the people which did not go into the treasury; I am speaking entirely of the sum which you took out of their pockets and put into the treasury.

Now, Sir, I have heard gentlemen argue at public meetings and in this House, that the difference between the two policies is not very great, that it is only

the difference between 17½ per cent and 31 per cent; that it is not so very much after all. I say, Sir, that the difference represents more than the mere difference between a 17½ and a 31 per cent tariff, and if hon. gentlemen will apply it to the importation of any given quantity of dry goods, they will see what I mean. Take \$100 worth of dry goods that came into this country under the Mackenzie tariff. The cost of importation, freight, insurance, &c., are given to me by a gentleman largely engaged in the trade, as amounting to 8 per cent. That makes \$108: add the 17½ per cent and you have \$125. Then the wholesaler has his profits to the original cost of importation, say 15 per cent, which added to the \$125, makes \$144. Then he sells to the retailer, who adds his profits of 25 per cent to the \$144, making at least \$180. So that under a 17½ per cent tariff the consumer pays \$180 for goods which cost \$100. Now, take it under a 31 per cent tariff. The importer brings in \$100 worth of goods upon which he pays \$8 as the cost of importing. Add the wholesaler's profit of 15 per cent, and the retailer's profit upon that of 25 per cent, and you have \$200 which the consumer pays for \$100 worth of goods under a 31 per cent tariff. So that the increased cost to the consumer on these goods is not the difference between 17½ and 31 per cent, but it is \$20 on every \$100; and any hon. gentleman can figure it out for himself and show me, if he can, wherein that statement is inaccurate. Therefore, I say there is a tremendous difference between the old Mackenzie tariff of 17½ per cent, which is generally known as a revenue tariff, and this protective system of 31 per cent. I say that is one of the evils, one of the minor evils, arising from this protective tariff. Then again, I say, this protective tariff prevents us from getting the benefit of the cheap goods which are produced abroad. The hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond), himself a strong supporter of the Government, told us to-day that goods costing a dollar a few years ago, can be bought abroad for 50 cents now; and that is true. I took the trouble a short time ago to examine the statistical returns of the exports from Great Britain as to the great leading textiles. It cost me some time and some labour and, although it may be a little tedious, I think it of sufficient importance to justify me in asking the House to listen while I read some of the figures. This statement was taken from the actual exports and the declared values of those exports, and shows how much goods have fallen in value where they are manufactured. The table I am about to read shows the exports and selling values of the great staple goods in 1874, 1884 and 1894: