

out the products of the American farmer? It is not necessary to argue this question in order to convince intelligent Canadian farmers of the advantage they receive from this protection. Hon. gentlemen say the people want to go back to free trade as it is in England. I do not think they do. Take the case of grain. I find that in one year the tariff shut out from this country American grain to the extent of 12,000,000 bushels, as compared with the amount which had formerly been brought in. The result is that the Canadian farmer has an increased market to that extent. I am willing to leave it to the farmers, for they are too intelligent to be deceived by the argument of gentlemen opposite. We are told by our opponents that the policy of this Government is class legislation, that they are legislating distinctly in favour of the manufacturers. What class of manufacturers. I would ask? The farmer is a manufacturer who is manufacturing products to go into consumption abroad as well as at home. If the Government are legislating for the manufacturer, they are legislating for the farmer, and they are doing so directly by putting a duty on such articles as the farmer produces. But we are told that the Canadian farmer wants free trade as they have it in England. The resolution before the House declares for a tariff for the purpose of raising a revenue and for that purpose alone, the element of protection being entirely removed from it. Before the Canadian people can judge of the value of the English system, they must know how the public revenue is raised in England. I have here a few items giving some information as to that point, and I read them so that the Canadian farmer, the Canadian artisan, the Canadian labourer may ask himself whether this system would be suitable to our conditions if it were applied. Great Britain raises a revenue of \$100,000,000 by customs duties. That is much the same plan as we adopt here. But they have also direct taxes. We have often told the Canadian people: If you return the Reformers to power they will adopt a policy which means direct taxation upon the Canadian farmer, labourer and artisan. Now, the Reformers tell the Canadian people: We are going to give you taxation upon the same principles as are applied in England, for the leader of the Opposition declares that to be the model, the aim of his party. In England they levy taxes upon the land. We have often told the Canadian farmer that if the Reformers were returned to power there would be a direct tax upon the lands of the country. How much do the English people raise by a direct tax upon the land? Under this system, which the Reformers tell the Canadian people would be suitable for our conditions, Great Britain raised \$5,134,000 last year by direct tax upon the land. Ask any farmer if he favours such a system. In Great Britain they levy a direct tax upon

houses. Ask any man living in a house in any of our cities, towns or villages, or upon any of our farms if he wishes to pay a direct tax upon his habitation? If he does, tell him to vote for hon. gentlemen opposite, for their policy leads to that, as it has led to it in England, and these hon. gentlemen say they will give us the same principles of taxation as in England. The inhabited house duty is levied at the rate of twopence on the pound for houses of a certain value, fourpence in the pound on another class and sixpence in the pound on another class, and last year, the total amount raised by this duty was \$7,205,000. Then in Great Britain they have a tax upon the right to kill game; a tax upon the right to carry a gun; a tax upon every male servant—fifteen shillings for each; a tax upon every carriage that is owned; a tax upon solicitors—I do not know that that would be such a great evil to the country, but however that may be, the tax is levied; a tax upon life insurance; a tax upon the right to sell patent medicines—hon. gentlemen might go into that extensively and collect a great deal of money; a tax upon bills of exchange; a tax upon receipts; a tax upon contracts—and so on. I would like to ask the Canadian people if they would like this to be the principle upon which our taxes are to be raised. Tax the land and you reach the farmer; tax the house and you reach the tenant; tax the servants and you reach the class who employ servants; tax the right to carry a gun and you reach the sportsman. Let the people understand the facts and I think they will realize the benefits which accrue to them from the policy of the present Government. I do not wish to continue this debate further, because I have taken up more time than I intended when I commenced. But I can only say that, in my opinion, the electorate of Canada only require to be well informed as to the policy of the Opposition to go and vote against that policy as they did in the past. Every time they have presented a policy in antagonism to the National Policy, since 1879, they have been defeated, and I believe they will meet with the same fate when they go back to the country again. They sometimes express an anxiety for an election. It is well for them that the election is kept off, because the sooner the election comes, the quicker they will be confounded, the quicker they will be relegated, for the fifth time, to the cold shades of Opposition. I say that the Canadian farmer only wants to know that the policy of the Opposition contains no protection for him, then he will not endorse that policy; the labourer only wants to know that it reduces his wages, that it reduces his opportunities of employment, then he will not endorse that policy; the manufacturer only wants to know that it brings him into competition with the slaughtered goods of the United States, that it destroys