

that year when he was making his Budget statement, the inland revenue made a return of \$6,825,000; for the next year, 1892, it had risen to \$8,007,000; in 1893 it remained at \$8,444,000. But then he took 1 cent per pound off the malt duty, relieving that article of \$50,000 of taxation, and the next season, 1894, his collections from inland revenue were still \$8,364,000; showing conclusively that instead of taking \$3,500,000 of taxes off the back of the Canadian tax-payer, he only took \$2,000,000 to begin with.

But, Sir, how do they set at defiance the principles of the National Policy in the present session as applied to their mode of providing for the present condition of things? Sir, I heard the Minister of Finance making merry at the deficits that existed when my hon. friend from South Oxford was Minister of Finance under the Mackenzie Administration; and he rejoiced at the idea of my hon. friend from South Oxford warming himself at a deficit of less than \$2,000,000. But the hon. Minister of Finance tried to warm himself last year by admitting that he had a deficit of \$1,200,000, but it did not seem to warm him up worth a cent; and this year, after figuring very carefully, he comes down to the House with this humiliating announcement that he has a deficit of \$4,500,000 in prospect for the current year. Fancy if you can, Mr. Speaker, the condition of things if the two parties in this House were to exchange places, and we were to present a deficit of \$4,500,000. Why, Sir, there would not be metaphors enough in the English language to express their indignation at the Minister of Finance who had so far forgotten himself and his country as to allow such an event to transpire. Now, the hon. gentleman turns around and he warms himself at a \$4,500,000 deficit. I should think it ought to make him comfortable if he thought my hon. friend rejoiced in one that did not come half way up to it.

But we listened to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) the other day telling us about the Conservative process of providing for a revenue. And what was it? After sneering at what he calls the way of hon. gentlemen on the Liberal side of the House, he says one way is by grinding down the wages of the employees, and the profits of capitalists, so that we can produce more cheaply in this country than in any other country in the world. That is the way the Liberal party raise their revenue. Another way is to put up the tariff so as to make outsiders who wish to come into this market, pay something for the privilege. That is the way the Conservative party propose to keep our markets for our own people. Is that the Conservative way to-day? Sir, that is ancient history; that does not apply to the Conservative party to-day; that is not their policy, as expounded by the Minister of Fi-

nance from his chair across the floor of this House. I sometimes think that the dominant political party in this Dominion has fallen on evil times, that it has fallen into the hands of men who do not realize the capacity and fidelity that characterized their predecessors. If my hon. friend from East Hastings is an authority on this question, I think we must conclude that the Minister of Finance to-day has sadly fallen from grace, according to that principle of the Conservative party expounded by my hon. friend from East Hastings.

Now, what are the resolutions that are pending to-day in connection with this matter? Is it proposed to make outsiders who wish to come into this market, pay for the privilege of getting in here. Let us see how he has set about to provide for it. He puts another half cent per pound on sugar, and he goes back to his great sheet anchor, whisky, that has stood him good stead time and again, and has been more valuable to him than any other commodity he ever touched, either in his political or social career. Sir, it was the whisky question that brought him before the public, and gave him his position in the House to-day. The whisky question is the great sheet anchor of the Minister of Finance, and the leader of this House. To-day, after taxing sugar, what does he do? He goes back to whisky, and he puts another 20 cents per gallon on whisky. He expects to get \$500,000 more out of this whisky tax, and \$1,250,000 out of the sugar tax, or about \$1,750,000 on whisky and sugar. How does the account stand, after taking off \$50,000 from malt last year? He took \$3,500,000 off the sugar in 1891, and he re-imposed on sugar, whisky and tobacco, \$3,300,000 between then and now. That is the way he carries out the Conservative policy. I say, Sir, if the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) is the correct exponent of the Conservative policy, he ought to hasten and take the Finance Minister in hand and bring him back to the position the party formerly occupied, for he has got altogether away from the good old Conservative path. But the hon. gentleman has got into the avenues of the people's pockets. I remember hearing of a little boy who was asked to write an essay on the natural history of man. He set about it after this fashion: Man is a little animal that walks on his hind legs and wears clothes; he is very quiet; you can put your hand on him anywhere and he won't kick, but you must not touch his pocket. Sir, when it came to the hour of necessity, with an ugly visaged deficit of \$4,500,000 haunting the dreams of the Finance Minister, and dogging him day and night, he did not take the National Policy mode of securing a revenue, by taxing outsiders who wished to bring something into the country. Oh, no; he went straight for the pockets of the