

necessary that I should spend any time in proving a self-evident proposition, because everybody in this country knows that what I say is a fact.

Mr. BORDEN. How is it with reference to the prices in other countries now?

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I am looking at things as they are in our own country. It is all very well to speak about the prices in other countries, but we know that the things we have in our own country are cheaper than ever they were before. Let us take a glance for a moment at the financial standing of this country and contrast it with our standing under the Liberal rule. When the hon. member for South Oxford went to London to raise a loan, he got £90 for his £100 bond bearing 4 per cent interest, and then he had to present the silver side of the shield to the financiers. When the present Minister of Finance went to London on a similar mission, he got £97 10s. for his £100 bonds and only paid 3 per cent, and he could have got many times the amount he required. This improvement in the credit of Canada and reduction of the cost of carrying its national debt, augmented as that debt has been by the extensive public works carried out by this Government, is due to the progressive policy of this Government. And the effect of these heavy expenditures on public works has simply been to add 18 cents per head per annum to the taxation of the population. The events of the past few years have increased confidence in Canada. So firmly established is our position that during the depression in 1893 the financiers and legislators of the United States were looking to us as an example to follow in amending their financial laws. We also find in leading English newspapers that Canada is quoted as a country which has escaped in a remarkable manner the storm of depression that swept over other countries. Glance for a moment at the effect of the National Policy on the wage-earners of this country. In 1891, according to the census, the Canadian manufacturers paid wages amounting to \$2,102,000. The boot and shoe manufacturers paid in wages \$4,916,000, harness and saddlery manufacturers, \$1,000,000, leather manufacturers, \$1,522,000. Here, in those very few items, we find that the wages paid amounted to \$7,500,000. My contention is that under a tariff for revenue only, this amount will be taken from the income of the people of this country. We also paid wages in other industries as follows:—

Smelting .....	\$ 851,000
Rolling mills .....	2,225,00.
Foundries and machine shops.....	5,152,000
Wire works .....	331,000
Tin works .....	463,000
Tin smelting, smithing.....	1,265,000
Agricultural implement makers.....	1,112,000

Here is an amount of \$12,000,000 which the wage-earners of Canada would be sure to

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

lose under a tariff for revenue only, or free trade as it is in England, or a policy from which every vestige of protection is taken. We should consider for a moment the effect of the loss of the very large amount of wages now received by the wage-earners of this country. The effect of it would be ruin to the artisan, the tradesman, the farmer, and the manufacturer. The wage-earner would be ruined by depriving his employer, the manufacturer, of the home market, which is now assured him by the National Policy and exposing him to the combined attacks of foreign manufacturers. As the hon. member for South Brant has said, we are living alongside a country whose manufactures have been fostered by protection until they have been enabled to challenge supremacy with Great Britain in some of the articles in which Great Britain excels. If that was true in 1876, when the hon. member for Brant gave utterance to that opinion, it must be true to a still greater extent now. The farmer also would be deprived of the home market which the wage-earners of this country now give him. The tradesmen would also suffer in the same way, as the wage-earner would be deprived of the means wherewith to patronize them. Thus all classes would be made to feel the dire results should we unfortunately adopt a tariff for revenue only or a tariff from which every vestige of protection is removed. The logical result of such a step would be an invitation to the farmers of the United States to come and take the bread out of the mouths of the farmers of our own country. The Opposition say in effect: We have taken down the barrier that prevented you from taking charge of the market in this Canada of ours; we have removed every vestige of protection. Bring your pork which is selling to-day in Chicago at about \$12 per barrel to Montreal where the price now is \$16 to \$18. You can bring it in here and destroy the home market which the National Policy had preserved for our own farmers. You will be able, under the tariff for revenue only, to bring in your oats which are selling to-day in Chicago at 28 cents per bushel, and 25 cents per bushel September delivery—you can bring them into this country where oats, owing to the National Policy are selling at 42 cts. in Montreal, 45 cts. in Halifax, and 38 to 40 cents in Prince Edward Island. You can bring in your wheat which you are selling to-day at 65 cents in Chicago to Toronto where the price is 85 cents. They say in effect to the people of the United States: Come with the wealth of your vast prairies, come with the surplus products of your long established manufactories—(the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) says they have been fostered by years of extreme protection)—come and possess this land which we throw open to you under a tariff for revenue only. Come and cut down the prices of our farm products which have hitherto been upheld by the National Policy.