

your beans, your oats, your buckwheat, your pease, your wheat? You send them abroad, because your market is there. Does the putting of a duty on increase the price of these things. What do you do with your mackerel? Suppose you put a duty of \$10 a barrel of mackerel, would it increase the price. Not a cent, because all our mackerel is shipped abroad, and finds its market in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. How about pork?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think it increases the price of pork at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Then why did you want a high duty on it?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will just come down to the very question of pork. We exported pork in the shape of bacon and ham, shoulders and sides, to the extent of about \$2,000,000 in value, and we imported \$96,000 worth.

Mr. IVES. We imported much less than we used to do before the duties were imposed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman stick to the point? I am arguing that where you are an exporter of an article in the proportion in which you export this, the putting on of a duty cannot affect the price.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would you take it off?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Finance Minister has done me the honour of asking me a question, and his friends seem very anxious to prevent me replying. I was going to answer it. I tell the hon. gentleman that the price paid for pork to the farmers—that is the undressed hog—is regulated by the market price in Chicago. I took the pains to go to the leading packers in the town from which I come, and I asked them the question so that I might read their answer in Parliament or elsewhere—and I have read it to thousands of farmers at many meetings—and they answered that the price they paid to the farmers is regulated by the price paid in Chicago. It is true, as was well shown by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that, owing to the wonderful facilities they have in Chicago for packing pork, they are enabled to sell it, when packed in barrels, cheaper, perhaps, than we can, but the price paid to the farmers is the same in the pork-packing states as is paid in the pork-packing centres of Canada.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would you take the duty off?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If we were in power the duties would be regulated according to a revenue tariff. That would be treated in the same way as other articles, and there would be no discrimination made.

But I have wearied the House already too long on these points and shall pass on. This system is indefensible on the grounds I have stated. It is utterly extravagant. Hon. gentlemen opposite entered upon a career of extravagance in 1881, and I wish to do the Finance Minister the justice of saying that I believe he made strenuous efforts, a few years ago, to stop it, but found himself powerless. With all his desires for economy and retrenchment, he was absolutely powerless in the hands of those who live by extravagant public expenditure. The expenditure under the Conservative Government, as I said before, has increased by \$14,000,000 yearly. If we should come into power, we shall be able to reduce that expenditure enormously.

Mr. FOSTER. How much?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will tell the hon. gentleman how much, but before doing so I will call his attention to a statement made by the Minister of Railways a couple of years ago. What did the hon. gentleman say then? He said, two years ago, when the expenditure was \$2,000,000 more than it is proposed to be next year, that it could not be cut down one dollar. Let me read from his speech on the Budget in 1894. He was then in a state of chronic defiance. He defied everybody. He defied the leader of proposed to be next year, that it could not down the expenditure one dollar. He defied the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) our future Finance Minister, to show where he could make any reductions. He spoke as follows:—

I defy the hon. gentlemen opposite to show in what particular they intend to reduce the amount of expenditure in this country. I defied them last session to do this, and I defy them again. Before the people of the country will consent to put these hon. gentlemen in power, they must be prepared to show in what respect the amount levied upon the people is in excess of the country's requirements. * * * What item is the hon. gentleman going to reduce; in what manner is he going to lighten the imposts upon the country? * * * What a farce it is for these hon. gentlemen to state that if they get into power, they will lessen the burdens of the people.

That was the song which the hon. gentleman sang in 1894. He said: I have looked over the public expenditure—civil service, public works, militia, North-west, and all the rest—and I defy you to cut down a dollar. He told us the same story five or six years ago, when the country was alarmed at the extravagant expenditure on the Intercolonial. I told the hon. gentleman from my place, year after year, that it was in the knowledge of every man in the maritime provinces that the Intercolonial was run on a scale of extravagance which was appalling, that if any man with a business head on his shoulders took charge, \$600,000 or \$700,000 a year could be knocked off without injury to the public service; that this money was being recklessly