assume for the purpose of this argument, and only for this purpose, that the taxes average 30 per cent. In that case our taxes on the cotton goods consumed in Canada would amount to considerably over $5,000,000, and the amount that goes into the treasury is only $1,100,000. In the case of sugar, of which the hon. gentleman has boasted so much, while I agree with him that the consumption is about 344,000,000 lbs., the tax is $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per pound, and though it may be quite true that the refiner was not able to extract the uttermost of his pound of flesh, but the people are compelled to pay at least $2,000,000 a year for the benefit of the refiner, while only about $80,000 goes into the public treasury. I take the case of binding twine, which the hon. gentleman has graciously been pleased to reduce from 2 cents to 1 cent. What was the amount of tax last year ? It was shown to be 2½ cents, or 25 per cent, on 10,000,000 lbs., meaning a tax of $250,000 a year, of which the revenue only received $42,000. I take the case of rice, and in regard to that article his calculations differ from mine. We imported of clean rice about 3,000,000 lbs., and of paddy or uncleaned rice about 20,000,000 lbs. I do not know exactly the loss in the conversion of unclean into clean rice, but all rice consumed in Canada paid 1¼ cents per pound, that being the tax on the cleaned articles. That means that the people paid somebody, though not into the treasury, a tax of at least $250,000, while the revenue received is only $80,000. I will not dwell on the results of this oppressive system as regards coal oil or iron, which enters so largely into the consumption of all agriculturists, or binder twine ; but taking those articles together, the taxes on the four which I have enumerated amount to from $8,000,000 to $9,000,000 a year, while all that is received by the revenue is only $1,250,000. I have paid no attention whatever to the well-known fact that in many of these cases the tax is enormously increased by the middleman's charges. It is well known to everybody that if you put a tax on an article and it passes, before it reaches the final consumer, through two or three hands, the tax is enormously increased. I have left that wholly and entirely out of the question. I have merely called attention to the enormous amount which, under the operation of any protective tariff is taken out of the people's pockets over and above the sum which goes into the revenue. On most of those articles the taxes are imposed so as to hurt the farmer more especially, and you must remember that over and above this high taxation, over and above the high bonuses given to protected manufacturers, the condition of things is such that almost the whole weight falls on the farmers under the McKinley Bill, because, although it may not benefit the United States consumer, it does injure the Canadian producer. You will find my other statement is perfectly correct, that under the combined operations of these three heavy systems of taxation, taxation for Government purposes, taxation for the benefit of protected manufacturers, and taxation under the McKinley tariff, every acre of land now under cultivation in any portion of Canada is practically subject to a heavy rent. In fact, in many parts of Canada that rent is, I believe, after a careful examination, fully equal to the outside rent that is paid in any part of England for ordinary farm lands. Sir, the hon. gentleman was good enough in a recent discussion to tell us that after all said and done it was really a law of nature, and that people nowadays will rush from the country to the towns, and there is no help for it. In other words, the policy of the Government may be defined as follows : They are aware there is a determination of blood to the head, and it is their policy by overtaxing the farmers, by making agriculture unproductive, to do everything in their power to increase it. That is practically their policy so far as the farmers are concerned. I turn to the manufacturers, the hon. gentleman's special protegees and friends. I am very dubious indeed if the great bulk of the manufacturers, as contradistinguished from a few specially petted interests, have gained anything under this tariff, and I make this assertion boldly. I think there is very strong reason to believe that the great bulk of the manufacturers in Canada would have prospered much more under the revenue tariff of 1878 than under the present system. Sir, those census statistics on which the hon. gentleman relies are essentially, I might almost say, on the face of them, statistics on which no thorough dependence can be placed. The hon. gentleman alluded some time ago to the very large increase in the number of industrial establishments. Well, Sir, that statement had attracted my eye also. I took eleven towns in Ontario which I knew best, and examined the list of industries, or rather industrial establishments which were credited to those towns, and I recommend hon. gentlemen in this House and my friends out of it to pay special attention to this list. I find that in Bowmanville, with a population of 3,377 souls, there were 86 industrial establishments ; in Cobourg, with 4,829 souls, there were 83 industrial establishments ; in Collingwood, with a population of 4,940, there were 78 industrial establishments ; in Napanee, of which I know something, with a population of 3,434, I was happy to learn, for the first time in my life, that it possessed 84 industrial establishments ; Oshawa, with a population of 4,066, had 94 industrial establishments ; Trenton, with a population of 4,300, had 62 industrial establishments ; Whitby, with a population of 2,786, had 92 industrial establishments ; Port Hope, with a population of 5,042, had 140 industrial establishments ; Strathroy, with a population of 3,316, had 132 industrial establishments ; Mount Forest, with a population of 2,214, had 92 industrial establishments ; in other words, in all those favoured places under the influence of the National Policy every five, six or seven fami-