

cent less than in 1878; bleached sheeting, 20 per cent less; Canton flannels, 27½ per cent less; bags, about 30 per cent less; yarns, 45 per cent less; bleached shirtings, 25 per cent less; tickings, 35 per cent less; apron checks, 40 per cent less; cheese cloth, 40 per cent less. At the same time we have mills employing over 8,000 people, and much capital, and paying over \$2,000,000 a year in wages, showing a state of things which surely it would be undesirable not to have in existence. Now, Sir, when prices have fallen here, what is the meaning of the hon. member for Queen's coming forward and telling us that prices have fallen in England? We know they have. The hon. gentleman's argument meant nothing if it did not mean that he would do away with the duty altogether, and let those cheap goods in to the destruction of our manufacturers. Suppose he did, what would be the result? Would not population, to the extent to which it is supported by these manufactories, disappear? And where would he get his revenue? People who remained would not get as good cottons nor one cent cheaper. The hon. gentleman went on to argue that in England, under the policy he still seemed to hanker after, the people were not taxed, and did not complain. Now, it so happens that we know what they are saying in England about the state of things there. Here is the report of Mr. Wilson Fox, assistant commissioner, on the county of Lincolnshire:

Farmers all protested against being assessed for income tax on half their rental. Many considered that one-fourth of their rental was the most they should be assessed on. As it is, the habit of many of the larger farmers to keep good accounts, a number of them have been successful in recent years in their appeals to the commissioners, and several income-tax commissioners informed me that the number of appeals has been increasing year by year.

Here are farmers complaining that they have to pay income tax on half their rental. Does any one suppose, if the hon. gentleman got rid of the protective policy, as he wants to, that we should not have an income tax here as they have it in England, and that our farmers would not cry out in the same way? Here is what Mr. Harry Rew says in his report on the Salsbury Plain District of Wiltshire:

I cannot do better than quote the following passage from a statement of his views sent me by Mr. E. A. Rawlence, as it fairly expresses the contention of those who advocate what is commonly termed protection:—"In regard to free trade, whatever may be the wisdom of maintaining this policy, it is useless to endeavour to close our eyes to the fact that the serious depreciation in the prices of all home-grown agricultural products is due to the glutting of our market by the surplus products of our colonies and foreign countries. It must of necessity happen that in some part of the globe there will each year be an abnormally productive crop, and hence a surplus, which must be disposed of at any price.

Mr. DAVIN.

Then, he gives the argument of this man, who shows from the custom-house returns the duties collected from imported products, such as chicory, coffee, cocoa, and chocolate, tea, currants, raisans, figs, plums, and prunes, making a total of £4,097,739, or over \$20,000,000. This farmer goes on to say:

It can scarcely be disputed that all the items enumerated in the above schedule are absolute necessities of life, as well for the cottager as for the peer, and almost as necessary as wheat and flour, and yet we tax these necessities, which we cannot produce, to the extent of over £4,000,000 per annum.

Now, Sir, the hon. member who preceded me spoke about the expenditure, and one speaker after another on the Opposition side sought to make out that the people are taxed to death. Let us have the duties on tea, coffee, cocoa, and chocolate that were in existence in the time of the previous regime, and we shall very soon have some millions of dollars to make the present deficit disappear. The hon. member, near the close of his remarks, came to the conclusion that there was just \$4,000,000 in excess of what ought to have been added to the expenditure. All we have to do to make up that sum is to put aside what we raised by inland revenue, about \$4,000,000, if I remember rightly, more than was raised in 1878. Nobody supposes that is a burden on the poor people of this country. Then, if you take the amount we raise from customs duties on such things as wines, diamonds, silks, satins, &c., you will find that we raise nearly as much on these things as would make up that amount which the hon. member thinks may possibly be in excess of what should have been raised. But there is the thing that surprises me; when hon. gentlemen talk about what our expenditure should be, as compared with what it was in 1878, they never enter into a calculation to explain how they would have carried on the public works which we have put into operation in that time. Would they have built the railways? If they would, they would have had to get money. Would they have had to deepen the canals? Nobody doubts that they would. We have at present the finest system of inland waterways in the world and well worth the money. Some hon. gentlemen talk about the income from these canals not being what it should be, but we have the Liberal papers asking now, as they have asked at other times, that there should be no tolls charged at all. Would we have had these put in operation? If so, they would have had to supply the money, and their expenditure would have been just as large as it is to-day, and probably larger. The proper way to estimate the burden is to consider the amount of interest that has to