

purposes. If the principle is correct, why not add a little more duty, and instead of 30 per cent increase the duties to 40 or 50 per cent? I admit that goods are cheaper to-day than they were twenty or forty or fifty years ago. But what are the reasons? One reason is that the facilities for manufacturing are much greater than they were at that time; labour perhaps is cheaper, raw material is cheaper, and the great cause and the almost only cause is that free trade England is now supplying the whole world, wherever her manufactured articles are carried, cheaper than any country that has protected manufacturing industries. Sir, we find that in 1874 England exported 220,599,074 yards of cotton yarns, worth £14,516,093 sterling, while in 1884 she exported 271,077,900 yards, and that quality only realized £13,811,767. Therefore, the same class of goods sold 18d. cheaper in 1884 than they sold in 1874. Now, in the year 1894, England exported 236,198,500 yards, which only realized £9,289,078 sterling, or 12·8 per cent cheaper than in the year 1884. That shows conclusively that free trade England can afford to manufacture and sell her manufactured goods cheaper than any country in the world. English goods are getting cheaper every year, and if goods are selling cheaper to-day in Canada, it is not because of the effects of the National Policy, but because our home-made articles have to compete with the goods manufactured in free trade England. Supposing that there were free trade between Canada and England now, and supposing English goods came in here free of duty, why, Sir, it is an undoubted fact that they would sell at from 25 to 40 per cent cheaper than they do now. However, I am not advocating a policy of allowing goods to come in here from foreign countries free of duty. I am well aware that a revenue has to be made up, and although the Liberal party is accused of being ready to wipe away the customs duties altogether, and to have recourse to direct taxation, I may say, Sir, that that is a false accusation, and I maintain that it was never the intention of the Liberal party to endeavour to carry out such a principle. Now, with reference to cotton fabrics. In 1874 England exported 4,417,481,000 yards which only realized £51,000,000 sterling, or 20·2 per cent cheaper than they sold for in 1874. In 1894 she exported 5,312,753,900 yards, which sold for £50,223,291, or 20½ per cent less than they realized in 1884. That shows that these articles are now being manufactured and that they are selling in England at from 25 to 30 per cent cheaper than they were selling twenty years ago, and that is the reason why the goods manufactured in Canada have to sell to-day at a correspondingly reduced price. Articles of iron and steel manufacture are just in the same category, and their com-

Mr. PERRY.

paratively lower price is regulated by the price in free trade England. Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of the great things they have done. They boast of our great North-west Territories. Well, ten or fifteen years ago we had some great expectations from the North-west, but where are they now? We believed then that the North-west was going to receive fifteen or twenty million people in ten years. We believed that it was going to be a home for the surplus population of some of the lower provinces, and we believed that we were going to receive a good revenue from it. These great prophets on the opposite benches told us all about that. I remember when Sir Charles Tupper made the statement from his seat in this House, that in 1892, Canada would have \$70,000,000 in its treasury as the proceeds of the sale of lands in the North-west. He told us that without a blush; and although we all know that he was apt to stretch things, yet this was one of his greatest exaggerations. If I asked the Finance Minister how much he has to-day as a surplus from the lands of the North-west his answer would be that Canada is paying \$150,000 a year more for the management of the North-west lands than the yearly revenue derived from them. We are told to-day that the railway companies—that is if they succeed, and no doubt they will, if they press hard enough—we are told that the railway companies want the Government to take their lands off their hands, and pay them a stipulated price per acre. Are the Government prepared to do that? We will see. My hon. friend from King's County (Mr. Macdonald) stated that the labourers, the artisans, and the farmers were better off under a protective system. He told us that the farmers' market for pork, beef, oats, and barley, was better than it would be if the farmers were not protected under the National Policy. He did not mention mackerel, because he had not the hardihood to do that. I hold that that argument of the hon. gentleman will not bear investigation, because we are not importers of pork, or beef, or mackerel or horses or sheep, or potatoes, or eggs. We have all these articles in abundance, and to sell, and I contend that although these articles are protected by the National Policy, yet that has nothing to do whatever with keeping up their prices. Although it may happen that pork in the barrel is something cheaper in Chicago than it is in Toronto, yet that does not go to prove that the Prince Edward Island pork, or the Canadian pork, as a general rule, will always carry the same price. A quantity of American pork is imported into Canada, which is used by lumbermen, but the Prince Edward Island pork, or the Canadian pork, as a general rule, can never be superseded by the American pork. The hon. gentleman also said that free trade