

that I would suggest to the Finance Minister, when dealing with the future deficit which is bound to be large, the advisability of putting a duty on titles, and thus limiting the number or adding greatly to the revenue of the country.

At an earlier period, I was referring to the fact that while on those things which the farmer buys he has to pay 35 per cent. yet, under the preferential tariff, the silks of fine ladies will come in on very advantageous terms. Here are the particulars. Of silks and manufactures of, we imported dutiable :

In—	
1896.....	\$2,564,491
1895.....	2,331,443
1894.....	2,489,930
1893.....	2,776,053

In no year did we import more from the United States than \$122,000 worth, which is, of course, a mere trifle. The duty paid in 1896 was \$773,950. Now, one-eighth of that will be \$96,743; and without any one wanting it and despite the demand of the Patrons of Industry to have luxuries taxed, that \$96,000 is this year taken off and thrown into the sea, and next year \$192,000. If you say that it will apply only to England, that will not help you because the great bulk of these things comes from England. Take wool and the manufactures of wool, \$6,970,000 out of \$8,723,000 came from England. Nearly all these are fine goods. The amount was \$9,413,731 in 1892, and \$10,306,786 in 1896 paid a duty of \$2,759,183.

How much are you going to put into the pockets of the well-to-do, into the pockets of those gentlemen whom my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce used to say the tariff was made for? The first year, under your preferential arrangement, \$344,900, and in the second year \$689,800, or in the two years, without any one asking you for it, you are going to put into the pockets of those people about a million dollars. And this applies to only one staple. On the whole, you will remit to the prosperous, to the fine lady and fine gentleman over \$3,000,000. From what source are you going to make that up? You will have to go to the farmers for the greater part of it. They will have to pay the greater part of that million dollars, and that is not in accordance with the principles enunciated by the Reform party. It is not in accord with the principles of the Patrons, whom the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce took to his heart and called friends and brothers, nor is it in accord with any sound view of what is in the interests of Canada.

I want to say one word as to the course taken with regard to our wheat. Two and a half cents a bushel has been taken off. I am afraid the result will be that we shall not be in the good position we enjoyed in the North-west Territories and Manitoba last year and the year before. In

Mr. DAVIN.

1895—and that was not nearly as good a year for us as last year, the prices of wheat at Duluth, and Winnipeg, and at Fort William, were as follows:—

1895.		Fort William.	Duluth.	Difference.
May	4.....	80	67	11½
do	7.....	79	65½	12¾
do	9.....	79	66¼	11¼
do	10.....	79½	65	13
do	16.....	85	70¾	12¾
do	23.....	1.00	80½	18
June	3.....	1.00	78½	20
July	22.....	81	69	9½
Sept.	14.....	58	54½	2
do	19.....	59	56	1½
do	23.....	59	54¾	3¾
do	26.....	60	55½	3
Oct.	4.....	60½	57¾	1¾
do	11.....	60	56½	2
do	14.....	59¾	56¾	1½
do	16.....	59¾	56¾	1¼
do	22.....	59	56¾	¾
do	24.....	59	57¼	¼
do	30.....	59	57¾	¼
Nov.	7.....	58	56	½
do	12.....	55	54¾	1¼
do	19.....	55	54½	1
do	21.....	55	54¾	¼
do	26.....	61	54½	5
do	30.....	59	54	3½
Dec.	2.....	60	54½	4
do	6.....	55	54½	1
do	21.....	54½	51¼	1¾
do	23.....	55	51¾	1¾
do	24.....	55	51	2½
do	28.....	55¾	52¾	1½

The prices at Fort William are values at which No. 1 Hard was sold on the respective dates. The Duluth quotations do not allow for 1 floating, which is ½ cent, and being on a basis of No. 1 Northern. Therefore, I allow 1½ cents for difference in prices obtained at those points, as the cost of taking wheat to eastern points, and Europe is the same. This is a fair comparison. These columns show the prices obtained at Fort William, which allows the 1½ cents difference for floating, and shows largely in favour of Canadian wheat. This was due to the tariff preventing American wheat coming in competition with our wheat.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. I have no doubt it is carried. No doubt conviction is carried to the mind of the people that the change was a bad one for the North-west, and it is perfectly gratuitous, for nobody was asking for it, so far as I know, and it can do no good whatever. But on the same plane with it is the removal of the duty on corn, which my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) knows some of the people in his own province object to. I have the "Commercial" here, in which there are articles pointing out that in 1896 the price of wheat in Manitoba was very much