

House of Commons Debates

FIFTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

SPEECH

OF

THOMAS BAIN, M.P.

ON

THE BUDGET

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, 21ST MAY, 1895.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). In rising to discuss the issues that are presented to the House this afternoon, the question of how we shall raise the necessary money for the purpose of administering the affairs of this country for the ensuing year, and the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford, as opposed to that of the Minister of Finance, I have only to say that I am distinctly in favour of the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford. In that respect I differ somewhat from the hon. gentleman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who has just taken his seat. I differ from him in several other matters, but I am able to agree with him when he lays a tribute of respect upon the grave of our departed Premier; because, I hold that the members of the Opposition respect the worth of that hon. gentleman, and realize the loss that Canada has sustained in his death, just as deeply as the hon. member for Grey ever could. While I congratulate the Minister of Finance upon his promotion to the leadership of this House, I have also to express my regret that, for the first time in my parliamentary experience we have been deprived of the presence of the actual leader in our midst, and I have found these double duties devolving upon the Minister of Finance. Now, I believe that, however much that hon. gentleman may display his ability in handling the finances of this country, it is not in the interest of his political party, nor of this country, that such a combina-

tion should exist. We now find the Premier sitting in another Chamber which is in no wise directly responsible to the people, and entirely independent of them in any form, and he is accompanied by the hon. gentleman who controls the one department that, perhaps, involves greater interests than all the other departments combined. I refer to the Department of Agriculture. When we find the lawyer who is the head of that branch of our service, is also located in the Senate, away from any contact with public sentiment, away from associations with the people's representatives, I think it will be found, under these circumstances, that the public interest will distinctly suffer. When I heard the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, deliver his singular utterance with respect to the people's choice of a man to represent the county of Antigonish in succession to the late Premier, it occurred to me that no more scathing criticism could be administered to his political party. Granted that half of what he said with respect to that hon. gentleman was true, which I do not grant, it merely shows that after the Minister of Justice went down into the county of Antigonish, and after they had put a family relative of the deceased Premier into the field to secure for him the sympathy and support of the circumstances under which the late Premier passed away, the people of Antigonish, in face of the policy advocated by that hon. gentleman, refused to elect their man, and sent my hon.

friend here to support the Liberal party. And yet my hon. friend from Grey comes down, and he, of all men in this House, says: "How have the mighty fallen!" It is words, only words.

Before proceeding to criticise the mode in which the Minister of Finance proposes to raise money for the next year, I want to say a few words about the position my hon. friend assumes to our party on this side of the House. He told us a very amusing story about a man out in the Western States, who, astride of a very bad horse, was riding around the country in a very indefinite manner, and he thought it would be a long time before he would overtake the Lord in that way. It occurred to me that that incident might have been applied a good deal nearer home, and not so very long ago. I remember when there was an enormous activity in political circles; I remember when this Government was hastening the preparation of the voters' lists of this Dominion, and circulars were sent out to the revising officers to get their work done at the appointed time. An extra staff of printers were employed in the department for the purpose of hastening on the preparation of these voters' lists, and have them all ready. For what purpose? Presumably for an appeal to the people. Every other kind of business was suspended, but suddenly there came an Order in Council to call us together here in session; and the Secretary of State has presented a Bill to the House to make these voters' lists good and valid for the current year, so that we need not take the trouble to revise them during this summer. Was all that gone through to enable the Minister to introduce this Bill? Did it not look very like as if hon. gentlemen opposite were mounted on that very scaly horse, and were meandering about in such fashion that they did not know where they were going? But, finally, instead of going to the people, they suddenly made up their mind it was not safe to trust the people, that they had better face the people's representatives once more in session.

Now, Sir, I want to draw attention to one or two statements that were made by the Controller of Customs to his address to the House the other day. I do it because naturally the utterances of an hon. gentleman occupying his position, who controls the Customs, the one large revenue-paying branch, are likely to attract attention and receive consideration at the hands of the people. What do we find that hon. gentleman said with respect to the expenditure of the Mackenzie Government, as compared with the expenditure on public affairs to-day? I read from the official report:

The total expenditure of 1872-73 was \$19,174,000. When the Reform party came into power in 1874, that expenditure jumped up to \$24,448,000, or an increase of \$5,318,000 in one year, in spite of their professions of economy.

Then the hon. gentleman goes on to moralize and prophesy. He said:

And I think it would require no prophet to assure us that, if they should come into power to-morrow, we would find history repeating itself.

Turning to the Public Accounts issued for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1894--what do I find? I find that the quotation made by the hon. gentleman does not quite agree with the official statement in the Public Accounts. The hon. gentleman said the expenditure in 1872-73 was so and so. So it was. But it so happened that the whole of the year 1872-73 was passed before the Mackenzie Government came into power, and four months of 1873-74, and that the Estimates for 1873-74 were passed by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir Leonard Tilley was Finance Minister, and one-third of the year had passed. The Controller of Customs concealed the fact that between those two periods we had added another province to confederation, and that the whole of the expenditure for Prince Edward Island was added to the expenses of the country. I am not surprised that the hon. the Controller has got himself into trouble in this House. I am not surprised that when the Minister of Railways and Canals was confronted with his campaign speeches during last fall, he found himself compelled to repudiate not only the statements of gentlemen who heard him make the statements attributed to him, but also the statements of his own official reporter. Let me draw the attention of the House to one more statement: That taking the whole of 1873-74, the Estimates for which were furnished by hon. gentlemen opposite, and in regard to which the preceding Government had expended four months of the revenue out of the twelve before Mr. Mackenzie came into office, during that year the total expenditure under the Mackenzie Government was only \$23,316,000, and when that Government went out in 1878, after administering public affairs during five years, the expenditure had only risen to \$23,503,000. The last year's expenditure of hon. gentlemen opposite has risen to the enormous sum of \$37,585,000, and yet the Controller of Customs has the cheek to come and tell this House about his economy as compared with the Administration of the Mackenzie Government. The debt statements are another example. We assumed in 1873 along with the administration of Prince Edward Island, a debt of \$4,700,000, which came into the accounts for the first time during the first year of Mr. Mackenzie's Government. Yet the Controller of Customs was not fair enough to make that statement.

But let me take another method with which hon. gentlemen opposite deal with the finances. We have heard considerable to-day from the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) with respect to certain expenditures

in Quebec, and we heard a beautiful fairy tale about \$50,000 which was being contributed for some Liberal annexation fund from the American side. I think the hon. gentleman should have listened to the statements of the Finance Minister the other day, when he told the House that the credit of the American Union was so low that while we could borrow money in England at $\frac{1}{6}$ per cent, the United States had to pay $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent; and yet the hon. member for Grey makes himself believe that they would spend \$50,000 for the purpose of annexing Canada to the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. That is why they are so anxious to get us annexed.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I admire the abiding faith of the hon. member for East Grey. If he can accept that, it is clear that his faith could remove mountains if necessary to make an impression in a political campaign. But I come back for a moment to the statement made by the Controller of Customs with respect to provincial expenditure. He gave the House a table showing increased expenditure of various provinces, and then he held up his hand in horror, and said. Look how these Grit Governments have increased the expenditures in the various provinces of the Dominion. The \$9,132,000 it took in 1894 to collect the revenue of the Dominion is the best answer to that statement; but he did not go so far as my respected friend, the member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), who told the House that Ontario had a debt of about \$1,500,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has it any debts?

Mr. CHARLTON. Do you say it has?

Mr. IVES. They have been selling securities.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has it any debts?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Yesterday there was an election in North Brant to fill a vacancy, and so low had the political strength of the party with which the hon. gentleman is allied sunk, that they did not put a man in the field to contest the election, and allowed a supporter of Sir Oliver Mowat to be elected by acclamation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think I may rise and say that that answer is not only disingenuous, but very unfair.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman gave way.

Mr. SPEAKER. The dignity of Parliament is not preserved by these interruptions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I trust the same ruling will be applied—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). The Secretary of State must admit that I am not guilty of interrupting hon. members across the floor of the House. What are the facts with respect to provincial debts—how does it tally with the political record of Ontario for the last 22 years? Sir Oliver Mowat has been Premier and administered the affairs of the province for 22 years. What is the strength of the Conservative party in that province to-day compared with the strength in its early history? Take the last session of the legislature, and on two occasions they succeeded on mustering, on a party vote, 23 and 25 respectively, out of a division list of 62 and 66 against them.

Mr. IVES. Let me ask the hon. gentleman: Did the proportion represent the popular vote of Ontario? How about the gerrymander?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I shall have a word to say about the gerrymander, if the hon. member for Texas will wait till a little later.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Has any one ever seen the Premier of Ontario go to London to borrow a dollar? Has there ever been a prospectus of the province of Ontario presented on the markets of the world to borrow money, as the Finance Minister of this Dominion has been doing at intervals of two years in succession lately?—and he will have to go there again before two years are over. That is the best answer. There is no province in the world of this broad Dominion that can present so fair a record in that respect as the province of Ontario. Let me present to hon. gentlemen opposite two short extracts from the two last budget speeches made by the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario. I presume, that no gentleman here will deny that the Provincial Treasurer knows about the affairs of that province, probably quite as well as the Controller of Customs here or the member for King's, P.E.I., (Mr. Macdonald). The Hon. Mr. Harcourt says in his budget speech of 1894:

Since confederation up to the close of 1893, our total grants to railways amount to \$5,959,000. The present value of our annuities outstanding is \$1,319,775, and at this very hour we have at our credit in the banks hard cash to the amount of \$1,550,000.

That is the province that these gentlemen tell us is in debt.

Mr. INGRAM. How did they get it?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). They did not get it by going over to England and borrowing money as the Finance Minister whom my hon. friends support has been in the habit of doing, at intervals of every two years. Here is a quotation from the budget speech of the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario, de-

livered on the 28th February, this year, and I will read it for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite :

All told, deducting present liabilities from our schedule of assets, we had at the end of last year a comfortable surplus of \$5,269,000.

That is the record of the province of Ontario. That is the record of twenty-two years of Liberal Administration under Sir Oliver Mowat; and where to-day is the political party that opposed him in that province? I have not a word of disrespect to say to my Conservative friends in Ontario, but I point to this: That after a prolonged siege, advancing the interests of that party, their last leader—and he was a gentleman of irreproachable personal character, and a first-class lawyer—retired on the Bench. He was succeeded by another gentleman at the last session of Parliament which met in February last, and I see it stated in the papers of the day that that gentleman is now anxious to be relieved from the cares of this little fragment of a political party up in the province of Ontario. Is not that the best evidence that the people of Ontario are satisfied that the Administration of Sir Oliver Mowat and his Liberal friends has been in the interest of the province?

Just about the time we assembled for the opening of Parliament, there was an election in the county of Haldimand. There was a revolt in the Orange order in Canada of which the Controller of Customs is the Grand Master. There was some trouble in the family because there was a section who were in open revolt and put a candidate in the field against the present Secretary of State. Where was the Grand Master of that organization? In that hour of trial for his friends and for the association of which he was the presiding officer, where was he? Was he on the field of battle to counsel and guide and advise those gentlemen who had given him an office of high trust, and made him for the time being their commander-in-chief? No, Sir, he tells us himself, that of all places on this earth, he was away down at Washington. I do not know whether he made that trip in the Government car "Jamaica," that is said now to be gone to California with another ex-member of the Cabinet, or not; but at all events the Controller of Customs tells us, that he was down in Washington. If a Grit goes down there, there is trouble at once; he is declared to be plotting for the ruin of his country, but it appears that when the Controller of Customs goes there he is not open to that charge. Well, Sir, I want to draw attention to the statement made by the Minister of Finance respecting the United States loan. After telling us that he had placed his Canadian loan on the market at such favourable terms, that after deducting all the costs and expenses, and all the other charges in connection with the loan over in London, he placed it at 3½ per cent. Then he goes on to say :

A short time after that the United States put an issue of bonds upon the market, and the rate of interest which those bear and which the United States have to pay, is within a fraction, in fact I think it is absolutely, 3¾ per cent, while the Canadian loan went on the British market at 3½ per cent.

Subsequent to that we had a little discussion with the Controller of Customs over the same question, and he confirmed the statement that our loan was made at the net value of 3½, the loan made by the United States bearing 4 per cent interest on the 30 years coin bonds for which \$65,000,000 was obtained. Now, whatever the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) went down to Washington for, he certainly did not secure much information about that loan. Sir, what were the facts? Twice in 1894 the Secretary of the Treasury issued bonds, but in November, at that particular period referred to by both the Finance Minister and the Controller of Customs, those 30-year old 4 per cent bonds were issued. The bonds that were placed on the market then, were bonds that ran for only a little over nine years, that bore 5 per cent interest on the face, and were sold for gold at a rate that netted a little under 3 per cent to the banks that purchased them, and the loan of February was selling then on the market currently, paying 2¾ per cent to purchasers. What led to the difficulties? It was simply this: That in the United States Congress there was a section of members who were determined to make the payments of the United States silver equivalent to gold, at the rate of 15½ to 1, when that coin on the market was only worth 33 to 1. The gold was flowing out of the United States treasury as rapidly as it came in until on the 28th of January, when the President sent his message to Congress, there was not enough of gold in the treasury available for three days' draft at the rate at which it had been going out of the treasury for the ten days previous. It was becoming a crisis in the United States. A contract was then made, after a great deal of negotiation, with not only the New York bankers (but also the Rothschilds of London, for the delivery of 3,500,000 ounces of standard gold coin of the United States, at the cost of the parties tendering, to the United States Treasury. It is true, those bonds were thirty years 4 per cent bonds, and they were sold to the bankers to yield 3¾ per cent, because the bankers took the risk of not being able to prevent the draft on the treasury, and they were bound to import half the gold required. Here is an important factor in that transaction which both hon. gentlemen omitted to mention. Why did they not tell us that the proposition stood open for ten days, which was made to Congress by these very same bankers, that instead of leaving the word "coin" in the contract, as it was gold they were supplying, they would take a 3 per cent gold bond at par in place of those very bonds? What did the New York "Tribune" of the

10th of February say about the refusal of Congress to endorse that proposition when it was laid before them by President Cleveland? It said this:

The President has made the necessary proposals to banks, but most judiciously has left ten days' time in which Congress, if it has the needful wisdom, can save the country \$14,000,000 by passing a proper Bond Bill. Pass some Bill with the proviso that the Secretary of the Treasury shall contract to pay the same kind of money that the Government asks from lenders. If it wants to borrow silver, let it pay silver. If it wants to borrow gold, let it be honourable enough, and also shrewd enough, to pay gold. Why not authorize the payment of the same kind of money that the Government actually borrows, with 3 per cent interest? Nothing but blind and stupid partisanship, it must be admitted, prevents this.

And yet, for the purpose of making the people of Canada believe that our credit was so much better than that of the United States, the Finance Minister was either misled by those who made up that statement, or he suppressed what was essential in a fair statement of the facts to the public. Sir, I have as much attachment to my country as the Finance Minister or any one else; I have lived in the riding I represent as long as I can remember; the whole of my interests are in this country; I take no back seat to any man in this House for attachment to my country and its institutions; but I have not seen the day when I would stoop so low as to misrepresent a neighbour for the purpose of advancing the interests of my own country. Hon. gentlemen opposite talked to us very freely about railway transactions in which the Liberal party have figured discreditably in the province of Quebec. I have nothing to do with the local financial affairs of the province of Quebec; but I want to remind the House that the gentlemen who shout so loudly about that transaction took the Hon. Mr. Mercier into court and endeavoured to establish the charges which they made against him so freely, and they signally failed.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). The grand jury gave the verdict, that is, the people.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Yes, we appealed to the people of Antigonish the other day, and we saw the result.

Now, I wish to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to a case that was before the courts of Montreal only a few days ago, and I will quote from the Montreal "Gazette" of the 14th of May, 1895, a statement made by Judge Desnoyers upon the application of the Solicitor General with respect to the suit against the contractor on the Curran bridge for a refund of money which the Solicitor General claimed he had got unfairly from this Government. Let me call attention to some of the details of that transaction. It related to two bridges across the

Lachine Canal and the Grand Trunk Railway. The Government engineer's first estimate of the cost of completing those bridges was \$160,000. But they proposed to make certain changes, to enable them to deepen the canal and improve the works, and the highest figure which the Government's own engineer gave as the cost of the work was \$223,000. Although the work was within two or three hours run by rail of the headquarters of the Government at Ottawa, what did they do? They paid \$394,000 for that work which their own engineer had estimated would cost \$223,000, and then they instituted a suit against their own contractors to try to get \$170,000 out of him. Let me make a few quotations from the statement of the judge upon the evidence placed before him with respect to the terms of the contract made by the department with the contractor, Mr. St. Louis. Here is a specimen of the wages which this precious economical Government contracted to pay to that contractor: A stonemason foreman was allowed \$4 a day for day time and \$6 for night time, \$8 a day for Sunday, and \$12 a day for Sunday overtime.

Mr. STEVENSON. You need to take breath after that.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). You will need to draw your breath when you tell the people of Peterboro' that you contracted to pay a superintendent \$12 a day for Sunday work. A double team got \$5 a day, and, when religiously at work on Sunday, it got \$10. What else do we find? We find that a derrick was worth \$2.75 in the daytime, but the same instrument was worth \$3.75 at night, and it was a religious derrick, because when it had to work on Sunday its conscience had to be appeased by giving it \$7.50. That was the contract made under the supervision of the Minister right here in this House. I am not speaking of what occurred outside, but of the contract that these gentlemen made with Mr. St. Louis. He went to work to carry out that contract. What does the judge say in addition? He says:

And on the same scale for stonemasons, stone-setters and skilled labourers, Mr. St. Louis' bills must have been tremendous, when it is remembered the job lasted four months, and that at times there were 2,000 men at work in the daytime and 1,500 men at work at night. The men were paid alternately every week. Mr. Michaud tells us that some of the pays amounted to \$34,000, some \$10,000, some \$15,000 and some \$20,000.

And yet that went on for four months, although all that time the Minister and his responsible subordinates could have left this House and run down to the work any afternoon, inspected what was going on, and made things right. That went on until, instead of paying out \$233,000, the Government paid nearly \$400,000, and yet they ask us to believe that they did not know anything about it, and that the whole thing

was economically administered. Let any hon. gentleman go to Ontario and present those figures to the electorate and try to make them believe that this expenditure was a really honest, just and fair expenditure of public money. When we find that the contractor destroyed his books because his safe was not big enough to hold them after he got through, and when we find him declaring under oath that he had given contributions to aid the party in power, need we go any further to find a reason why this extravagance was allowed to go on unchecked? What did the judge say? Did he instruct Mr. St. Louis to pay back this money? No; he goes on to say:

There was no proper surveillance by the officers of the Government on two of the jobs at least, viz., the Grand Trunk bridge and lock No. 1 of the Lachine Canal. The time-keeping on the two latter jobs seems to have been left to take care of itself, as far as the Government officers were concerned, so much so that two prominent public officers, high in office, lost their situation on that account. Mr. St. Louis procured all the workmen that were asked of him. He did not keep time personally, he had several clerks to do it, and one of them stuffed the lists. This was sworn to by himself, to his own disgrace; and when these lists were so made and cooked, they were certified blindly and as a matter of form by the officers of the Government.

And yet this is the Government which undertakes to tell us that they are administering the affairs of the country carefully. The judge thus sums up:

In my opinion, the main causes of all the trouble in this matter are:

1st. The extortionate prices stipulated for labour in Mr. St. Louis' contract, and, 2nd. the almost unlimited number of men on the said works, so numerous that they were in one another's way, and Mr. St. Louis cannot be held criminally responsible for these causes.

And the judge ruled that St. Louis had only worked up to the contract of the Government, and declined to order him to pay back the money. I ask if you can parallel that record in Ontario, or any other province of this Dominion under the administration of the Liberal party?

But hon. gentlemen opposite have undertaken to show that the policy of the Opposition is unfavourable to the farmer. They have told us that protection has been a blessing to the farmer. I wish to glance at that statement for a moment. You remember, Sir, that when the National Policy was inaugurated, we were told that it was to create a home market which would consume our farm products raised at home. Hon. gentlemen opposite declared that to be the best market, and they said further that, in consequence of the stimulus afforded by the National Policy our manufacturers would be able to manufacture what we wanted at home. In short, we were to put an end to our foreign trade by consuming our farm products at home. The enormous population of operatives,

which the National Policy was to place in our midst, would consume our farm products, and, then we would be under no necessity to import from abroad because we would make everything at home. What are the facts? Last year we exported nearly \$50,000,000 worth of farm products after we had fed all the operatives which the National Policy had brought into Canada. I ask you, Sir, as a business man, how long it will be before, at the present rate, we will have sufficient consuming population established in the country to overtake the production of our farmers, even supposing our farmers stood still and did not increase their production at all? What are the facts with respect to the protective policy as it affects the farmer? These hon. gentlemen talk to us about taking off the duties and allowing the Canadian market to be flooded with American agricultural products. Do these hon. gentlemen know that to-day beef is being shipped from Toronto to the market of Buffalo to meet the wants of the people on that side of the river? People do not ship products into a lower market from a higher and pay a heavy duty besides. All winter long the hog market, about which they make much fuss, has been higher in Buffalo, has been higher even in Chicago, than it has been in Toronto. And yet these hon. gentlemen, in the face of these facts, will maintain that the National Policy protects the farmer. Sir, I was amused when the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) made that beautiful statement of his, with respect to how the National Policy operated to protect the farmers of Canada. He said:

One way is by grinding down the wages of employees and the profits of capitalists, so that we can produce more cheaply in this country than any other country in the world; that is the way of hon. gentlemen opposite. Another way is to put up a tariff which will make outsiders who wish to come into this market, pay something for the privilege; that is the Conservative way—the way in which we propose to keep our market for our own people.

Sir, how do they tax those who wish to obtain access to our markets, so far as the farmer is concerned, when this is the position of affairs to-day? What is the use of telling us that there is protection in it for the farmers? Why, Sir, the fact is that these hon. gentlemen are dealing with a condition of things that, if it ever existed under the National Policy, existed long ago, and the fact is that the hon. gentleman has got far behind the times and is entirely astray from the facts as they apply to us to-day. So far as the farmers of to-day are concerned, the effect is all in the other direction. Here is what a farmer says with respect to the influence of the National Policy upon one industry, that is the butter and cheese industry. During the last session of the Ontario Parliament, Mr. MacPherson, of Glengarry, spoke thus:

A careful study of the expenditure and returns of the business shows that the price of machinery and other modern appliances for butter-making has been increased by the Federal tariff sufficiently to raise the cost of producing butter from 1 to 2 cents per pound, and ventured the opinion, that, with improved methods and reduced taxation, butter in a few years could be produced in Ontario at from 8 to 10 cents per pound.

Did he believe that the National Policy was good for the farmer? Did he believe that the protection that was afforded to them was any benefit to them? Certainly not; and every intelligent farmer will share his opinion. The fact stands out fair and plain that in the year 1894 nearly \$50,000,000 of a surplus had to be shipped out of Canada after providing for the wants of our own population.

But they tell us that the price of wheat has gone up to-day. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has gone up; but what are the circumstances under which it has gone up? Sir, I supposed that when we developed our railway system in the North-west and gave sixty-two and a half millions of Canada's hard coin to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, we should have had a great highway that would have brought our western produce down within our own borders and brought it to our own seaboard, shipping it entirely over Canadian territory. But what are the facts? Every one knows that the bulk of the wheat of the North-west went out of the hands of the farmers last fall at from 38 to 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds, of the finest grade of hard wheat that is raised anywhere on the face of the earth, and that, so far as the Ontario farmer is concerned, the bulk of his crop was marketed at about 50 cents per bushel. A large proportion of the surplus of our North-west grain found its way down on the American side from Duluth. And why? Simply because American bottoms gave cheaper rates to outside markets than our own lines would give, though they had been bonussed so freely by Canadian money. What was the result? Two large milling companies, the Lake of the Woods Company and the Ogilvie Company proceeded to corral all the surplus wheat in the North-west that they could lay their hands on. Meantime, the farmers in the older provinces, with wheat below a cent a pound, fed it freely to their stock and used it up in various ways, making the most economical use they could make of it. To-day the price of wheat is high because the companies I speak of have cornered the market and the stock is not in the hands of the farmers. Is that a benefit to the farmers? Is that a benefit to the consumers? I venture to say that the only parties benefited by it are these speculators and a few small holders of grain scattered throughout the province of Ontario. With the latter I have sympathy, with the former I have none. These are the facts as to the National Policy as applied to the prices of grain to-day.

Our friends opposite are never tired of telling us about the relative position of the farmer in Canada and the farmer in England. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) told us to-day that the English farmer was in a difficult position, that he was being taxed right and left, and he and the Controller of Customs and the hon. member for East Hastings quoted to us long paragraphs to show that the British farmer was demanding protection. What is the position as between the Canadian farmer and the English farmer? All that we ask is to be placed on the same level as the English farmer to-day, and we do not ask any better protection than they have at the present moment, nor will we be satisfied with anything less. The English farmer to-day buys everything he consumes at the lowest possible rate. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that. But the Canadian farmer finds that his agricultural implements, such as reapers, mowers and binders are taxed 20 per cent; and the small tools he requires, such as scythes, forks, rakes, and the whole catalogue of smaller implements used on the farm are taxed 35 per cent. And taxes collected from the Canadian farmer are not for the benefit of the treasury. The Controller of Customs admitted the other day that when the question arose as to the value that should be placed upon these implements for duty when they were imported for the use of the Canadian people, he did not refer the matter to independent officers but to the manager of the combine in Canada that controls the works that manufacture these very implements. If any evidence were wanted to show that this Government is not an independent government of the people, but the servant of the combinations, we have it in that one simple fact. Take, for instance, the sugar that the British farmer consumes to-day, and what do we find? According to the London quotations to-day the sugar that cost 4½ cents a pound here is sold in England at 3 cents, and it is as good to the farmer there who buys it as if he paid 4½ cents per pound for all he consumed. And so with all the articles that he uses, he buys them at the lowest possible rates for he is in the market of the world where everything is sold at its fair value. And the only article he pays an increased price upon is his tea, which is dutiable at fourpence a pound, and his coffee, which pays 14 shillings a hundred, or 1½ pence a pound. The average consumption of tea in England is about 6¼ pounds per head; and, allowing the consumption of coffee to be one-third additional, the English farmer does not pay more than 75 cents per year duty on these articles more than the Canadian farmer pays, who has those articles free. I say that under these circumstances, all we ask is that the burdens shall be taken off the back of the Canadian farmer, and that nothing more shall be placed upon him than his fair and legitimate share of the

necessary expenditures in connection with the economical administration of the public affairs of this country; and that the extra taxes that are rolled upon him for the maintenance of these combinations under this tariff, and of these various other protective institutions, shall be removed from his back, and that he shall be given the same kind of fair-play that the British farmer receives.

Let me say one word further as to the plea these gentlemen are making that the British farmers are asking for protection. Sir, it will be a sorry day for the National Policy in Canada if the British farmers succeed in getting protection imposed. I would like to see the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite who are telling us that the British farmer wants protection; I would like to see them go to the people, after their policy had been adopted in England, and tell the people that Canada's cheese was taxed 4 cents per pound to get into the British market; that Canada's beef was taxed 20 or 30 per cent to find its way into the British market; that Canada's wheat was taxed 15 cents per bushel to get there. Where would the shouting be about the protection that the National Policy gave our people? Do they believe that when Great Britain inaugurates the policy of protection, as they would lead us to believe, she is going to protect Canada? Won't she protect Great Britain first? And won't these protective taxes be imposed for the benefit of the British public, and not for the benefit of Canadian farmers? Then our friends opposite and their policy will be wiped out, and they will find just where their arguments have landed them.

But, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite are never tired telling us about the effect of the National Policy in building up our industries. Now, I do not propose to deal with the broad statements about what has been done. I think it is wiser to start the machine, and see how it operates, where you know the facts. These gentlemen forget, when they make these statements, that there were active, energetic, and successful manufacturing industries in Canada long before the National Policy was inaugurated. Sir, I remember in my own town that in 1873, just at the time the Mackenzie Government was called to take power, we had a cotton mill, one of the earliest cotton mills started in this Dominion. It had been operated since 1859, and it had gradually grown up and developed with the country. At that time, the former proprietor died, and it was deemed necessary to enlarge the enterprise, and the public were appealed to take stock in it. The stock was extended then to \$400,000; and this is the statement that was made as to the result of the operation of that cotton mill in previous years:

The mills, with their present capacity, are now earning upwards of 12½ per cent, or more than 8 per cent upon the proposed capital of \$400,000.

That was in 1873, under a 15 and a 17½ per cent tariff. Well, Sir, the National Policy came into operation, and what is the result to-day? That cotton mill has been closed for several years, the \$400,000 capital has been dissipated, and not one dollar of it has been returned to the original investors. To-day, the men who, on the faith of the National Policy, and the development connected with it, invested their little savings in that town in building little homes for their future comfort, have had to sell these at a sacrifice, and, in the majority of cases, have left the country to secure employment and earn a livelihood for themselves and their families. What was the position of the Ontario Cotton Mill at Hamilton? I speak of what I know. A friend of mine, a gentleman that I know personally, lost \$20,000 in that venture out of \$30,000 he invested, and he was only one man. Another gentleman that I know had a couple of thousand dollars in another mill. We have heard a good deal about what these mills are doing for the employment of operatives. If you go back to the census of 1891, you will find there is a cotton mill in a town about twenty or thirty miles west of where I live, which is returned as employing 180 hands, and as paying out \$42,000 a year in wages. When you divide that up amongst the hands, it comes to the magnificent figures of \$4.25 each, per week. Last year, under the benign influences of the National Policy, even that pittance of wages was twice reduced, under the blessings of the administration of this cotton ring that now controls that rail. Do you call that a blessing to the operatives of Canada? Is that the way the National Policy was to give employment and develop the country? In the same town there is a wincey mill that figures in the census of 1891 as employing 100 hands and paying in wages, \$20,000. It has been standing idle, and is closed. The \$20,000 is no longer paid, and the operatives are scattered to find a living as best they can. But this mill figures regularly in the returns of the industries that the National Policy has brought into existence. Now, let me draw your attention to another result of the National Policy, as applied to the cotton industry. Our cotton mills in Dundas, so far as my recollection goes, went under the control of the Dominion Cotton Company, and I think their annual report of two years ago shows that the company controlled ten mills, scattered throughout this Dominion. What is the effect of that centralization of the cotton industries on the operatives in these various mills? I can speak again from personal observation. One mill, after running four days in the week for two or three years, finally ceased to run altogether, under the blessings of the National Policy, the operatives had to seek employment elsewhere, and they went to another mill under the control of this com-

pany. They left their families in their little homes in my town and went there to work. They tried it for a month or two, and what was the statement they made? They said, the wages are so miserably low that by the time we have paid for board, we have nothing left with which to maintain our families away from us, and to meet the increased cost due to the different members of the family not living in one household. What became of them? They had either to accept the pittance offered, or to take the other alternative and leave this country and go to a foreign land to earn the bread that the National Policy denied them. What has been the result as applied to the Dominion Cotton Company? They simply closed down the mills and regulated the output according to the consumption. But they exercised mighty good care to have the benefit of the full protection that the National Policy gave them. What is the amount of their last dividend? Here is a quotation from one of the Montreal papers of only last month:

In spite of the bad year, the Dominion Cotton Company has earned \$320,000, or 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent nearly, on their full capital of \$3,000,000. When it is remembered that at least half of this capital is watered, the actual earnings are very large.

And that amount is wrung out of the operatives because they simply have to take the alternative of accepting the wages this combination chooses to give them or leaving the country, because if they leave the mill and go to any other mill in this country they are confronted with the same control. That is one of the blessings of the National Policy as applied to the cotton industry of this country, and that is one of the things for which we are asked to bow down and be thankful.

Sir, let me draw attention to one other institution, an institution organized in Toronto at the time the National Policy was brought into existence for the purpose of presenting to the people the great blessings the National Policy was going to confer on them. I quote from the Toronto "World," an orthodox journal on that side of the House:

This institution started in with a paid-up stock of \$200,000. They got from various friends in addition \$100,000 more. Under the pretense of giving business men an equivalent for their money, they obtained \$200,000 more, which altogether amounted to about \$500,000.

The institution did not prosper—it could not meet expenses. Last November a fresh syndicate took hold of the institution, and did they offer its old stockholders 100 cents on the dollar for their investment? Not at all. They asked them to hand over their stock without receiving one cent, and in return the new syndicate was to rejuvenate the concern and put it on a paying basis. They started in November to put this establishment on a paying basis. They operated it

for some weeks, and what became of it? It died a natural death.

An hon. MEMBER. Unnatural death.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Yes, it was strangled. Nobody would furnish money any longer to run it, it could not earn enough to run itself and pay the management. What did they do? They superannuated one public officer in Toronto and appointed the manager in his place at \$3,000 a year, and on 6th February, in the middle of the cold winter, they opened their doors and turned out all the operatives and left them on the street to shift for themselves. That is the history of the "Empire" journal, the great organ of the political party opposite.

What is the history of the National Policy as applied to the agricultural implement industry? You can scarcely go into a town or village of any importance throughout western Ontario but you will find an establishment lying idle, the whole capital invested lost and the proprietors doing—what? Either going into other lines, or acting as agents for the great central combination which controls that industry. Has that been a blessing to the people of Ontario? Has it been a blessing that the various establishments scattered over the country should be closed and the business centralized at two or three points? I think the majority of the people of western Ontario will agree with me in saying it has not. You cannot go into a town or village of any importance in the west but you will find one of these dormant industries. The chimney will be standing there all right, the building will be there but the operatives have gone and the capital—where is it? Just a few months ago I had occasion to visit an active town in the centre of a good agricultural district in the county represented by the Secretary of State, old Haldimand. I happened to walk into a large brick building, and I said to the gentleman in possession: For what purpose was this establishment erected? His answer was, this was erected for a shoe factory. I asked, how much capital was put into it? He replied, about \$25,000. I asked, did they make any money? He replied, no; we did not make any money, the capital is all gone, and I have rented the building for \$70 a year as a place in which to carry on my little-business. That is the revenue arising from the investment of \$25,000. I do not select this as a special example, because all over the province there are such examples. I venture to say that more capital is locked up in dormant industries in Ontario than was ever locked up in any other en.cept one enterprise promoted at an ea. by this Government in connection with the North-west, and that was when they started that great boom that was going to make everybody rich—the Colonization Companies. Sir, there are thousands of Ontario people to-day who are

paying interest on money that was invested in those companies, who have a lively recollection of the wild goose chase led them by hon. gentlemen opposite when booming these enterprises. There never was a time in the history of Canada as last winter when the banks were so crowded with money, not seeking employment, but gathered in from active industry until the bankers were driven almost to despair to know what to do with it, and yet parallel with this is the fact that there never was a time in the history of Canada when so many men honestly seeking for labour on the street were denied such labour and thereby their daily bread. This is another proof of the effect of the National Policy as applied to-day.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are never tired of telling us about the development of the trade which is being secured to us outside of Canada, and the benefits that accrue to us in consequence of the development of that trade. What are they doing on that agricultural implement manufacturing industry to-day? Only a few months ago the Government passed an Order in Council providing that when a manufacturer exported one of these implements outside of Canada, and sold it to the competitors of the Canadian farmers in the United States, the Argentine Republic, Great Britain, or anywhere else, the manufacturer should get back 99 per cent of the duties that he paid upon the raw material that entered into the production of that implement. How did the Government treat the Canadian farmer with respect to that implement? Let me quote to you on that matter, a few words from the organs of the Patrons of Industry.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Do hon. gentlemen opposite think that the Patrons are not farmers? Do you think that they have not got intelligence the same as we have? I heard one gentleman on that side of the House use the term "illiterate Patrons, if there are any." You did not hear it from this side of the House, but he qualifies it; illiterate Patrons, "if there are any." Sir, I say it is an insult to the agricultural population of this country. It is an insult to the Patrons of this country. What is the reason that the Patron institution is in existence to-day? It is simply as a protest against the burdens that this Government have imposed upon the farming community. They feel that things are out of joint, that they are not getting fair-play under the present administration of public affairs, and like everybody else they band themselves together for the purpose of advancing their own interests. Sir, I remember when gentlemen opposite cultivated that organization very carefully, just a little less than a year ago. All the nice things they could think of were said about the Patrons and their policy; but for how long? Just while

they tried to use them for the purpose of defeating the Ontario Government, and when gentlemen opposite did not succeed in making the Patrons a tool for that purpose, then they turned around, and now they call them "illiterate Patrons." I point to the existence of that organization as an evidence of the feeling of unrest that is abroad to-day, because of the conditions induced by hon. gentlemen opposite and their policy as applied to the country. Now, this is what the Patron organ said on the 1st of May, so that it applies to the present time, and it is none of your seventeen-year old fairy tales such as we have heard from that side of the House:

The low tariff makes it more profitable for England to trade with them than with Canada. It is obvious the Canadian farmer, taxed by the tariff and combines till his back is sore, is in no position to compete with Argentina. Not content with imposing those drawbacks on ourselves, we have recently ordered that the Canadian manufacturer of implements, who imports his pig iron, coal, steel, &c., and pays high duties thereon, shall be allowed a remission of 99 per cent of the duty when the finished goods are destined for Argentina, Australia, United States, or any other foreign competitor, but shall pay the whole amount of duty and charge it to the Canadian consumer, with interest and profit added, when the machine is sold here at home. To "promote Canadian industry: keep Canada for the Canadians."

And this is to promote Canadian industry and to keep Canada for the Canadians. I recommend hon. gentlemen opposite to wrestle with these facts, and I ask them if they are not literally true? The pig iron that goes into these implements has been taxed at the rate of \$4 a ton, and if it is Canadian iron there is \$2 a ton bounty added to enable the Canadian manufacturer to produce it. All his other articles are taxed in the same ratio from \$10 to \$13 a ton on the other various grades of iron that enter into the manufacturing of these implements. Everything is taxed for the benefit of somebody else, and just as the paper I have quoted from says: If that implement is sold to the Canadian farmer, he has to pay every cent of that duty, whereas if it sold to his competitor down in Argentina he gets every cent off. Do you call that keeping Canada for the Canadians?

Now, just let me look for a moment at the competition the Canadian farmers have to face. We have to find a market outside of Canada for \$50,000,000 worth of our Canadian products, and who do we compete with? We compete with Argentina, for example, that last year, according to the British official returns, sent 13,000,000 cwts. of wheat to the British market, sent 30,000 live cattle, and sent one and a-half million carcasses of frozen mutton. Under what conditions do the people of the Argentine Republic ship these products to the British market? The River La Platte is navigable for 2,000 miles

for large vessels up into those great plains of Argentina. They raise that wheat and those cattle almost in sight of the ocean steamer that takes those goods on board and delivers them into the English market where they meet us on exactly even terms. What is our position in Canada? We gave \$62,500,000 to build the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry our products from the great plains of the North-west down to the ocean, and we have charged such high rates on that railway that the bulk of that wheat last fall found its way through American channels down to the seaboard. We have to meet the Argentine farmers in that open market of England under those conditions, and, Mr. Speaker, do the Government call that keeping Canada for the Canadians? In addition to that, these gentlemen in Argentina have this advantage, that while we are taxed at from 30 to 35 per cent on what we buy and consume, their duties run from 5 per cent on cottons up to 10 and 15 per cent on other goods. They do not pay half the duty that we pay to begin with, and they sell goods against us in the world's markets on even terms. And yet gentlemen opposite tell us that the National Policy is a blessing to Canada, when we have to sell in face of that competition, and when we have that competition more intensified by the action of this very Government in giving the Argentine farmers their implements at a rate of duty cheaper than what is imposed on the raw material that enters into our implements. Sir, let me quote to you one statement made by an American as to the energy and development of that country as our competitor. He said:

Before long Argentina will yet eclipse Chicago as the meat-packing centre of the world.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker, and we are selling those men implements cheaper to-day than we sell them to our own people, and our Government calls that protecting the Canadian farmer. Let me draw your attention, Sir, to another advantage that the farmers of Argentina have over us. I quote from an Englishman who is an ardent advocate of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, as applied to England. I quote from Mr. Howard Vincent, with whom we are all familiar. He speaks of the internal economy of Argentina, and he says:

A paper money now depreciated between 200 and 300 per cent, now secures nearly as much labour and food as it did when it was at or nearly par. The premium on gold is of the greatest advantage to the agriculturists. They pay for their labour, food, and indeed for their holdings, in depreciated paper, and they receive gold for their exported herds and crops. Its reduction will be firmly resisted by them by all possible means, and, if sudden or violent, would entail serious disaster. To the merchant it is different. He has to pay gold for what he imports, and can with difficulty obtain its equivalent in paper when he sells, and people cannot understand why he wants so much more "na-

tional" money for his goods than before, and buy sparingly or dispense with the article.

And this is the kind of competition that our Government is encouraging to-day by taking the duty off the implements that we sell to them and putting it on the Canadian farmer who has to compete with them.

In connection with that matter let me draw attention to the methods this Government have adopted for the increase of our trade. Sir Charles Tupper, in 1888, foreshadowed the idea of stimulating our West India trade by subsidizing a line of steamers for that purpose, and in 1890 our present Minister of Finance took a trip down to the West Indies with the aid of his private secretary, and at the cost of nearly \$1,300 spied out the land to see how the trade was. In the following season the Jamaica exhibition was opened and we spent \$22,000 in pushing our products before the people of Jamaica. We sent, as our commissioner, our old friend, whom we all remember and whom we liked to see so well for his genial ways, Mr. Adam Brown, of Hamilton, and spent some \$5,000 for his services and expenses as our agent. In addition to that, we subsidized a line of steamers to develop that trade, to the extent of from \$73,000 to \$97,000 a year for the last four years. What has been the result of all this labour, and this liberal expenditure? Let us compare the trade with the West Indies in the five years from 1874 to 1878, with the trade which has been developed under this National Policy boom from 1890 to 1894. For the first five years, our average exports were \$3,720,000 per year, whereas, in the latter five years they were \$3,195,000 a year. So that, notwithstanding these subsidies of about \$90,000 a year, we have not created much of a market for Canadian products in the West Indies. But what does the comparison show with regard to our imports from the West Indies? During the five years from 1874 to 1878, our average imports were \$1,678,000 per year, and during the five years from 1890 to 1894, they were \$3,666,000 per year. That was a magnificent development, was it not? We had increased our imports to more than double. But let me draw your attention to a little event that intervened in the interim. We had taken the duty off raw sugar altogether; and if you examine our trade in detail, you will find that great development to be due to that fact, and not to the subsidies given to the line of steamships.

Mr. WELSH. Free trade.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It was free trade as they have it in England applied to sugar—that free trade which hon. gentlemen opposite are so worried over, and which they are so anxious to ascertain the meaning of. On these imports the average duty per year collected, in the first period, was \$646,000; and in the last period, \$687,000; but

the average of the last three years, after the duty had been taken off, was only \$293,000; showing that the increased trade was not due to the subsidies, but to the fact that we afforded the West Indies a better market for their sugar by removing the duty. As a result, we have sacrificed about \$400,000 a year of revenue, besides the subsidies of \$90,000, without succeeding in getting a market for one dollar's worth more of Canadian products. What are we doing in regard to the Australian trade that we have heard so much about—another mode in which it is proposed to protect Canada for the Canadians?

The Prime Minister inaugurated the efforts of the Government to develop a trade with Australia by going out there and travelling around on a pleasure trip, which cost us \$2,745. We have also sent an agent to Australia. This Government, it appears, can do nothing to develop a trade anywhere without sending out an agent, and we have Mr. Jarke out there, at a salary of \$3,000 and expenses, to look after our interests and develop our business. In addition to that, we are paying \$121,000 a year by way of subsidy for nine trips of steamers between Canada and that country. As a result of these efforts, we are developing a trade with Australia without doubt; but we are not going to be able to send any cotton goods there, if we are to judge by last year's exports of our highly protected cotton combine, because I find that they sent just \$8 worth of cotton goods to the whole of Australia. Whatever goods we do send to Australia will be agricultural implements and machinery, on which our people have to pay the full tax under the National Policy, while it will all be taken off to enable the Australians to get cheaper machinery than our own people. Now, what does Australia send to us? Everybody knows that it is a great wool-producing and mutton-producing country. Let us look at the goods we got from Australia last year. They do not amount to very much; but the chief imports I will mention. We got \$6,250 worth of green apples. Now, we raise apples in Canada, and we consider them pretty good ones. We imported from Australia, also, 59,000 pounds of butter, valued at \$10,421. I do not think we need to bring butter into Canada from Australia, and to subsidize steamers in order to do so. Of lard, bacon, salt beef, &c., we brought in \$1,300 worth, and we brought in 61,200 pounds of mutton, valued at \$1,797. I think it will be admitted by all hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that these are not articles which we should spend money in order to bring into Canada; and yet these are the chief imports that came to us last year from Australia. Now, how does the National Policy protect the farmer in the matter of wool? It carefully puts a duty on such wool as

we produce a surplus of in Canada; but it does not charge one farthing upon the wool which the Australians send into Canada; that comes in free. Now, what does the Dominion Grange think of this attempt to promote trade with Australia? Hon. gentlemen opposite sneered a little while ago at the name of the Patrons of Industry, when they were mentioned in this House; let them sneer at the Dominion Grange. I can only say that that organization was brought into existence because of the pressure of circumstances that drove together men who felt that they were being unfairly treated under the policy of the Government; and what do they say? This is not the history of seventeen years ago, but the history of to-day, dealing with the live issues of the moment:

We desire to enter our most strenuous protest against subsidizing a line of steamships to Australia. As the products of that country are similar to the agricultural products of Canada, but are produced at a very much less cost, this would be a blow at our home market, and taxing ourselves to destroy our interests.

I think the majority of thinking men will say that is a fair estimate of the efforts the Government are making to develop trade by taking money out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers to subsidize lines of steamships to bring into Canada goods to compete with the products of our own people of which we have already a surplus. Under these circumstances, it would be a wonder if organizations of this kind had not grown up in our midst, and if they did not feel that the pressure was more than they were willing to endure.

But, Sir, I want, for a moment to glance at the process by which the Government are now working out the details of the National Policy. They told us that they proposed to tax the goods of those people who want to find their way into the Canadian market, and they proposed to do this for the purpose of keeping Canada for the Canadians. That might have been true some years ago. Is it true to-day? What is the history of the changes of taxation as developed under the administration of the present Government? Let us look for a moment at the mode in which they have developed our taxation. When the Finance Minister first entered on his office this is the statement which he made on the 27th March, 1890:

I stated last year, that, looking at the condition of the country and looking at the munificent contributions which have been given by this country for her public works—it seems to me that we ought not, after the close of the year 1889, to increase the public debt. That we ought not to increase the public expenditure for ordinary purposes, and that it was possible to meet the capital obligations we had already assumed, and to go to the year 1892 without adding to our net debt. After that we might consider whether or

not we could not gradually decrease the debt which we have assumed and placed on ourselves.

He was then referring to the year 1889, and he repeated and emphasized that statement. He said :

Now, Sir, I am here to-day, one year after the time of making that statement, to affirm with equal truth to-day, \$36,500,000 of ordinary expenditure from our Consolidated Revenue Fund is sufficient to carry our debt, pay our interest, pay all our ordinary expenditures, and leave \$2,000,000 in the hands of the Minister of Public Works each year to build new and necessary public works.

To carry her present burdens Canada is amply sufficient, but for any further increase I believe good reasons are demanded and good reasons must be given.

Did he confine the expenditure to that \$36,500,000 ? Look at the Estimates for 1895 of \$38,517,000 and judge for yourself.

He boasts to us of the expenditure made on our public works. Look, he said, at our railways, at our canals, see the development of our resources by these means. What are the returns that they present to us ? The expenditure on these public works was somewhere about \$149,000,000, as the hon. gentleman correctly stated. On the Intercolonial, the expenditure was \$44,966,424. On our canals the expenditure was \$44,709,038 ; on the Canadian Pacific Railway our expenditure on capital amounted to \$62,601,535, making altogether \$149,000,000. Now, these are in the investments about which the hon. Minister is so proud. Let us see what revenues flow into the treasury from those various investments. Look at the Intercolonial of last year. Our revenue was \$2,987,000, and the working expenses \$2,981,000, so that we had a net revenue of \$5,832. But on the expenditure of the \$44,900,000, where does the country raise the money to pay the interest ? The Government take it out of the taxpayers of the Dominion. Even the small pittance of a revenue from the Intercolonial is not left us, because in operating the Prince Edward Island Railway we are \$66,000 short of revenue to meet the current expenses ; and that is an improvement for which I give the Minister of Railways credit. What is the revenue from our other great works ? Take the canals upon which we spent nearly \$42,000,000, and on which we are still spending millions of dollars for the year 1894, our revenue was \$387,000. The expenses of maintaining the canal staff and making the repairs necessary to keep the canals in working order, without providing for the renewals or improvements, was \$534,000, leaving a net deficit of \$147,000. And besides we have to pay every cent of interest on the original \$149,000,000, the cost of the construction of those works. How does the case stand in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, upon which we have expended \$62,500,000 ? Who owns that road ? Does Canada own it or control it ? Has Canada anything to say in the ad-

ministration of that great public work ? No, Sir, that \$62,600,000 belongs to a distinct and independent company.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was reminding the House that a few years ago we on this side of the House were accused of not desiring a through line of railway upon Canadian territory, and we were continually lectured upon the disloyalty of a system that made connections with the North-west Territory through the United States. I referred to the fact that we had contributed \$62,600,000 of good solid Canadian money to the Canadian Pacific Railway and that the line was now the property of the company. I want to draw your attention, Sir, to the developments that have taken place since these early days of the Canadian Pacific Railway system. That road covers a distance between Montreal on the east, to Vancouver on the Pacific Ocean, of a little over 2,900 miles over Canadian soil. What do we find to-day in addition to that ? We find that what is known as the "Soo" branch of that railway runs from the main line to American territory at the foot of Lake Superior, where a connection is made with an American system of railway. From that point we find two railway systems running westward controlled and operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, one system known as the Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic, operating, according to the last report, 584 miles of road, and the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Sault Ste. Marie system operating 1,167 miles, or a total of 1,751 miles of this grand national Canadian railway system operating on American territory. And we find in addition that the security of this grand enterprise that Canada has so liberally bonussed in order to put it on a sound financial footing is pledged for the payment of the bonds of these systems. According to Poor's Manual of Railroads, the most recent issue of which I was able to consult was that of 1893, I find that the bonds of these two companies for which the revenues of this system of ours are pledged, amount to no less a sum than \$53,000,000. And what further do we find ? We find this Canadian system giving connection from Montreal by way of Sault Ste. Marie and St. Paul and west through the great American state of Dakota and northward until it strikes the Canadian Pacific main line west of Regina at a small junction ; and we find them running their through Pullman cars over American territory and giving that territory exactly the same railway facilities that they give to Canadians on our main line towards which we have contributed so much. And the men who have sustained

and endorsed that system are the men who call themselves patriotic Canadians and who are very fond of crying "annexation" against gentlemen on this side of the House who decline to be bound by such expressions of sentiment.

Now let me turn for a moment as a matter of comparison, and ascertain what are the revenues derived by some of our sister colonies from the railways which they built and which they own and control. I showed before six o'clock that the \$149,000,000 that we have invested in our Intercolonial Railway, in our canal system and in the Canadian Pacific Railway did not yield us one dollar towards payment of interest, so that every year the tax-payers of the Dominion have to feel in their pockets for the interest upon these great expenditures. I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that on the canal system alone, in the payment for care and maintenance, we were \$147,000 out of pocket. I turn to the Australian Government railways and in their Year-Book for 1894, giving their returns for the year 1893, the last returns available, I find some figures that should be interesting to Canadians. We find that in New South Wales the government owns and operates 2,351 miles of railway, constructed at a capital cost of £34,657,000 sterling. The gross revenues of that system for the year 1893 were £2,927,000, which, after paying all expenses left net earnings of £1,188,000, or over 3 per cent on the total investment for the construction of those railways. Lest it should be said that this is an isolated example, I turn to the sister colony of New Zealand, the figures for whose railways for the year ending 31st March, 1893, the latest available returns, are before me. The government in that year operated 1,886 miles of railway, the total cost of which for construction was £14,733,000 sterling. The net earnings, after paying working expenses, were £449,380, or a return upon the capital invested of over 3 per cent. For another example I turn to the colony of Victoria. That colony owns 2,975 miles of railway. These railways are reported upon in four divisions. The northern division has a mileage of 836. The net revenue of this system after paying working expenses was sufficient to yield a return of 2.97 per cent on the capital cost. The north-east division, covering 603 miles of road, earned a net dividend of over 4¼ per cent. The eastern section of 500 miles was operated at a slight loss. The western section of 1,018 miles yielded a net dividend of over 3 per cent, and the balance, the Hudson Bay Railway, 4¾ per cent on cost. And let me draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the further fact that the year for which these figures are given was the year of the great financial crisis in the Australian colonies, and the reports of the Victoria system speak of decreased freight and passenger traffic, while they state that the regular equipment which was sufficient to transact the ordinary business

had been maintained. Mr. Speaker, I point to the position of our sister colonies as compared with that of this Dominion, and I ask, in all fairness, whether the producing population of Canada to-day are receiving returns from these investments compared with the burdens that are placed upon them thereby. The fact that we are receiving no revenue from so large an expenditure is not creditable to the administration of public affairs here, as compared with that in these sister colonies.

Now, Sir, let me turn for a few moments to some of the statements made by the Finance Minister with respect to the taxation that he said he had taken off the shoulders of the tax-payers of this country, and as to our financial position to-day. You remember, Sir, when, in 1891, the hon. gentleman came down to the House and intimated to us that he had decided to take three and a half millions of taxation off the backs of the Canadian tax-payers. That was an exceedingly liberal proposition on the face of it, to be presented in one session to any legislative assembly such as we have here. But, Mr. Speaker, how was it that the hon. gentleman became suddenly so generous to the tax-payers of the Dominion of Canada? I do not think we need to go very far to ascertain the reason. On the American side, for reasons best known to themselves, sugar was made free, and it was an object lesson in taxation that no Government could stand very long, to see a staple article of consumption like sugar sold just across an imaginary line at 4 cents per pound, while here it was 6½ cents. The Minister of Finance made a virtue of necessity, and took off \$3,500,000 of duty from the tax-payers of Canada. Here is how he announces it in his Budget speech of 1891:

Sugar has always been looked upon in Canada as a large producer of revenue. Sugar in one respect is one of the best articles possible for distributing taxation. The rich and the poor use it largely in proportion to their means, and there is, possibly, no article upon which a part of the revenue of the country can be more equitably placed. The Government has come to the conclusion to sweep away from the burdens of the great mass of the people, with one stroke of the pen, \$3,500,000 of taxation.

"Of taxation." Those of us who were in this House previous to that time, remember the pitched battles that used to be indulged in across the floor of this House as to who bore the burden of this taxation. This time there was no hesitation on the part of the Minister of Finance in announcing that this was a burden of taxation, not upon the people outside of Canada who wanted to sell us sugar, but upon the consuming population of Canada who bought and used that sugar. But there is this remarkable feature in the matter to which I wish to draw attention, that the Minister always stops in his Budget speech at this point in his quotation. Now, I want to extend the quotation a little fur-

ther down in that same speech. The next paragraph goes on to say :

We propose to ask the House to allow us to put on \$1,500,000, and the question is where to put it on.

And he proceeded to put on taxes thus : he added 1 cent per pound additional on malt, and he estimated the yield would be \$500,000 revenue. He added 20 cents per gallon excise duty on whisky, which he estimated would yield \$600,000 ; and he added 5 cents per pound more on tobacco, and he estimated the revenue from that at \$400,000, making, in all, \$1,500,000 of taxes that he immediately imposed, at the same time that he took off \$3,500,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I may be a little obtuse, but it does strike me that when a man takes credit for taking off \$3,500,000 of taxation, and, at the same time, puts on \$1,500,000 on other necessaries or luxuries that our people are consuming, it is not a very brilliant stroke of policy. I do not think it takes a very large-sized statesman to accomplish an operation like that, and I do not think it justifies the statement that at one sweep he had relieved the people of taxes to the extent of \$3,500,000, when he immediately put on \$1,500,000 without giving the people one breathing moment to realize what it meant to be relieved of \$3,500,000. And, Mr. Speaker, there is more than that, he got the additional taxes that were imposed, for 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 taxpayer, 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 Finance 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 Canadian consumers, and he placed half a cent on sugar that he knew they could not escape, and when they take a drink of whisky they have to contribute another 20 per cent to the purpose of creating this revenue.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. That is not enough.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I have no objection to the whisky men contributing it. But I have to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to this, that if the principles expounded by the Finance Minister in the early and callow years of his political life were correct, we are making it more and more difficult every year for the people of the Dominion to reach that point which the hon. gentleman formerly said meant the well-being of the people, wiping out this revenue from liquor and prohibiting its consumption in our midst. That is the direction in which we are drifting.

But this does not cover the whole of the question. I want to draw attention to the difference between the policy of the Liberals and the National Policy, and I think the sugar question will illustrate it about as effectively as anything I can present to the House. The Americans under the McKinley Act of 1891, struck off the duty on raw sugar and sugars up to No. 16 Dutch standard, and left the duty of half a cent per pound on refined sugar for the benefit of the American sugar trust. At one operation they took \$60,000,000 of taxes off their people. What is the position

to-day of the sugar tariff here in Canada? Does the half cent a pound going into the treasury represent the amount of duty that the people of this country pay for their refined sugar? No. We have another tax, and it does not come out of the Americans either, it comes out of the consumers of sugar in Canada—it is a tax of 64 cents additional on every 100 pounds. For the protection of whom? The Canadian consumer? No—the Canadian refiner of sugar. Let us apply that to the sugar imports of last season, and see how it will operate. We imported in round numbers a little over 300,000,000 pounds of raw sugar in 1894. Say that 50,000,000 went direct into family consumption for ordinary purposes, and that 250,000,000 of that importation passed through the hands of the refiners. What is the result of the application of this system of protection to-day? Why, Sir, the McKinley tariff, as an engine for securing revenue for the sugar trust, is nowhere, it is not in it; and I will show you why. Take 250,000,000 pounds of raw sugar imported into Canada last year. The protection to the refiner on that sugar under the American tariff would have been \$1,250,000. What is it under the tariff we are operating here to-day? No less than \$1,600,000. Last summer when the fight was on in Washington with the sugar trust, and it took all summer to settle the question, the difficulty was over the amount of protection the Americans would give the sugar refineries; and at the close of that contest where were the sugar refineries placed? They were given one-eighth of one per cent of duty extra on refined sugar imposed for their protection; instead of 64 cents per 100 pounds given in Canada, they were only allowing 12½ cents per 100 pounds. We sometimes reach results better by comparison. For the last three months the dividend of the American sugar trust, with that protection of 12½ cents per 100 pounds; was 3 per cent in the quarter on a capital of \$75,000,000, and experts on the American side say the whole of the sugar could be refined with a plant not costing over \$15,000,000. Yet one-eighth of one per cent gives a sufficient return to pay on this enormous capital 3 per cent per quarter, or 12 per cent per annum, whereas our refiners are protected to nearly five times that amount, and instead of getting \$312,500, as the American extra protection to the trust would give them on our imports of sugar, they received \$1,600,000 protection from this Government. There is a line of cleavage between the policy represented on this side of the House and the policy represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. We do not object to bearing the burdens sufficient for the necessary maintenance and for the expenditure of this country; we are willing to carry the burdens necessary to pay interest on our public debt, heavy as it is; we are willing to bear the burdens imposed for the necessary working

expenditure, but we are not willing to become burden bearers for specially protected industries after this fashion.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that free trade as spoken of in Britain is impracticable here. I, for myself, and I speak for myself, say we are perfectly willing to bear the burdens imposed on our goods by a tariff that will enable us to meet our current expenditures; but so long as I am in a position to protest I will protest against being called on to maintain industries that cannot stand on their own legs. On this point I desire to draw the attention of the House to an article printed in the "Mail" a short time ago, an organ that cannot be accused of leaning towards popular sentiment, and this article was printed after it became the organ of the Government. It is as follows:—

The plea of those who want to locate newcomers here at any cost is, that we cannot expect them to come unless inducements are offered. This policy has been sufficiently illustrated in Ontario. Again and again it has been necessary for the legislature to do something to check the evil.

There have been peripatetic industries, the proprietors of which looked out for a "good bonus," started their mills, worked up the subsidy, and then looked out "for fresh fields and pastures new."

If the natural and commercial advantages of a place are not sufficient to attract manufacturing enterprises, it had better wait till they are.

It is no use trying to grow the plant of commerce by the aid of the expensive manure of subsidies. It wastes the substance of the people in uncertain speculations.

It wastes the substance of our country today in bolstering up industries and supporting institutions that are not able to stand upon their own limbs.

Sometimes, they tell us, that our Canadian industries would not be able to take care of themselves. Sir, I do not endorse that doctrine. Let me quote one example—and I have to acknowledge my indebtedness again to the "Toronto World"—to show what is done every day by Canadian industries which have never asked the Government for drawbacks on goods which they have exported, but who honestly consume Canadian iron in their industry and pay the burdens that were imposed upon them, and sell their goods to the community in open competition. Here is what the "Toronto World," in the month of March said with respect to one of these industries. Speaking with the representative of a new establishment in Toronto that was entering into the manufacture of bicycles, it says:

I am every day becoming more firmly convinced that we can manufacture bicycles and machinery just as well and cheaply in Canada as in any other country in the world. In proof of this I may say that we have just received from Messrs. Bertram & Co., of Dundas, a consignment of lathes, special tools and formers for use in the manufacture of our bicycles, which cost us one-third the figure tendered by some of

the leading United States manufacturers. These tools and machines were made from the models of these in use by the Beeston, Humber Company, of England, acknowledged to be the most accurate and perfect in design, perhaps, in use at the present time. I sent the same specifications that went to Bertram & Co. to the United States firms, and the difference in the tenders sent in fairly staggered me. I can tell you. We, of course, then awarded the contract to the lowest tenderers, and we are now more than pleased at the manner in which the Dundas firm carried out their work.

Here is an establishment that has not asked to be bolstered up and protected. They are friendly to the National Policy, staunch supporters of it; but, in the face of all those facts, here is the evidence that they do manufacture successfully to-day, and that they put cheaper goods upon the market than can be bought on the American side. These are men who have pluck sufficient to attend to their business, and they do not belong to that type of manufacturers who have to go around and lean on this Government for aid and support.

Sir, with respect to the question of how Canada should be developed and our industries advanced, I want to present the House with a quotation from a journal that has never been accused of being Liberal in its political antecedents or associations, and which has been known as the organ of a section of this community which has been solidly and staunchly Conservative. Let me read from that article briefly, for the information of the House. I think it puts the question in better form, and it answers the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite much better than I can do. It was dated the 14th March, 1895, and it says:

Canada ought to be one of the greatest and most progressive nations of the world. The Dominion covers one-fifteenth of the earth's surface, embraces about 40 per cent of the British Empire, and is only exceeded in extent by Russia, and its resources are in keeping with its extent.

But it does not progress as it should. We are supposed to have drawn 800,000 immigrants from Europe in the ten years ending 1890, yet our net increase of population was only 500,000 as against 19 per cent in the previous decade.

There are several reasons, but the chief one after all for the slow advancement of Canada is found in the trade conditions that exist.

We want consumers for the products of our fisheries, forests, mines and farms far beyond the capacity of this country to supply.

This want could be supplied by the United States to a certain extent, but their terms—free trade with them and discrimination against the mother country—are such as no loyal citizen of the Empire could accept.

Across the sea, in the British Isles, is a market for all, and more than all, that we can produce. Why do we not furnish a larger portion of her supplies? Because it is a natural law of commerce that trade cannot flow all one way—one nation cannot sell to another without buying something in return.

And as we in Canada by an almost prohibitive tariff on British goods restrict our purchases in

Great Britain, we, by that very act, restrict our sales to that country also.

What should be done, therefore, is to make a sweeping reduction in the customs duties now levied on manufactured goods imported from the United Kingdom. The adoption of this policy would vastly cheapen many articles that are used daily by our people. It will, by increasing our purchases in the mother country, add to our sales there as well, and it will make the cities of Canada the purchasing market for hundreds of thousands living just across the border.

Two objections to this policy may be anticipated. The alleged difficulty in raising a revenue and the interference with local manufacturing enterprises. In reply to the first objection: The increase in the consumption of British goods would more than make for the national treasury for the reduction in the rate of customs taxation, besides reducing the expenses of the Government. Canada is offering \$750,000 of a yearly subsidy for a fast steamship service on the Atlantic, and the treasury is now being drawn upon for what is virtually a subsidy to increase our butter exports to England. Withdraw the artificial barriers against trade with the mother country erected by ourselves, and there will be a sudden bound in the commercial intercourse between us that will make both of the above expedients unnecessary.

Sir, that is not my language. That is the language of the Orange "Sentinel," a journal which has never been accused of Liberal proclivities. I commend it to the gentlemen opposite who are wandering around in the gloom and darkness of the past by-gone years, wondering what free trade as they have it in Great Britain means. Here is one of their own friends who has no difficulty in expounding the policy we are advocating with respect to developing and advancing the interests of our people in Canada.

But, we are sometimes told that we are not very consistent in our advocacy of trade relations, and that one time we talk reciprocity, and continental free trade, and trade with Great Britain, and lots of other statements are made like that. I want to give to you, Mr. Speaker, an authority on the advantages to our people of trade with the United States that will not be disputed by even the Minister of Finance himself, when I quote it. It is the opinion of a gentleman who has been in this House for many years, and this is the statement he makes before his electors, gathered last summer for the purpose of discussing the selection of a candidate for his county. He said:

He had a duty to perform before leaving Parliament, and he had already induced the United States Government to reduce the tariff on horses, barley and coal, and he was still in communication with an agent of the United States Government to bring about a further reduction in the American tariff which would benefit the farmers. He further stated that no person would be more disappointed than Sir Mackenzie Bowell, if he did not receive the nomination.

Is that not rank heresy to proceed from any gentleman who is a supporter of the National Policy? Why, Sir, it is worthy of

a Grit of the deepest dye. He says that it is a benefit to the Canadian farmer to have the United States tariff reduced, and that he is securing reductions on horses, barley, and coal. Why, Sir, it was my respected friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) who said this; and I am quoting from a report in an organ of the Government of the day, written by a friendly hand.

Sir, I have been grieved and ashamed to listen to hon. gentlemen opposite denouncing day in and day out the position of the mother country—the country that has never failed to stand by Canadian interests, that has given us the shelter of her protection and the shelter of her name through good report and evil report. Yes, these men are never done telling us that in free trade Britain distress prevails everywhere, and that people are suffering and in want, and are travelling towards a protective policy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They are preaching blue ruin in England.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Yes, preaching blue ruin in England. They carefully quote to us some of the campaign speeches of the Conservative party in England, made a year or two ago; but they do not quote to us the divisions of the House that have recently taken place on any of those questions. It may do to go into the country and tell the farmers that they are oppressed, that competition from the outside is straining their resources and reducing the income of their estates; and if you apply that statement to the proprietors of those estates, it is perfectly true; but if you look back through the history of England for a few generations, you will find that some of those gentlemen gave very little, indeed, for the estates from which they are drawing large revenues to-day. Suppose the prices of the products of the farm were doubled to-morrow, and kept so for a few years, how much of the increase do hon. gentlemen suppose would fall to the average tenant farmer? Would not the aristocracy who control their lands immediately proceed to put up their rents to match?

But I want to call attention to another quotation, bearing on this very question, from a journal which cannot be accused of Grit proclivities or of being unfriendly to the Government of the day; and I commend to hon. gentlemen opposite the sturdy and vigorous language in which it characterizes their conduct in thus belittling the mother country that has done so much for us. If they turn to the "Orange Sentinel" of the 25th April last they will find this paragraph, headed, "Distress in Great Britain":

Many United States and some Canadian papers are constantly telling us that great distress prevails in Britain. The British Parliament appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of affairs. The inquiry included the

period of the great storms in Britain, storms unprecedented for more than fifty years. In spite of this terrible weather, the people of Great Britain suffered less actual distress and have been more prosperous than those of any other country under the sun.

The commission sent out inquiries to all localities in England, and received 1,194 replies from districts representing over 20,000,000 of a population, with these results: 569 localities, with a population of nearly 7,000,000, report no exceptional distress; 454 localities, with a population of over 10,000,000, report that there is exceptional distress, due solely to the severity of the winter; 144 localities, with a population of 3,700,000, report exceptional distress from want of employment, due to slackness of trade, depression in agriculture, or particular local or industrial causes.

Scotland, Wales and Ireland are dealt with separately, and show that, apart from the severity of the weather, no exceptional distress prevails.

The returns prove conclusively that the mass of the British people are not suffering. Britain holds her own in everything that tends to make a people great, and lying telegrams to Yankee papers are only sent to help the combines and commercial thieves in the United States, who find it pays to abuse Britain.

We regret that any Canadian paper should reproduce these lying despatches and try to bolster up Canadian combines.

That, Sir, is no statement from my side of the House. It is a statement from a journal that has never staggered in its allegiance to hon. gentlemen opposite; but the force of the truth compelled it manfully to administer this scathing rebuke to those of hon. gentlemen opposite who are perpetually belittling the country which is the birth-place of many of us and the land we are all proud to be associated with. Sir, we are sometimes told that the National Policy has developed the country, has kept our people from leaving us, and has built up in our midst industries that have been of advantage to our people.

There is just one thing to which I wish to draw the attention of the House before I conclude, and which I think does not quite correspond with this statement. I refer to the redistributions that have taken place in my own province of Ontario and throughout the Dominion generally. You will remember, Sir, that after the census of 1881, when there was a Redistribution Act passed in 1882, Ontario had so far advanced in population and development that she was entitled to four additional members. Manitoba had also grown in the short period between that and the time she was constituted a separate province, and a member added to her representation, and the confederacy was entitled, by increase of population, to five additional representatives in the House of Commons. Ten years of the National Policy passed over the country. We took the census of 1891, and we came to the redistribution of 1892, and what did we find? We found that in the premier province of Ontario our population

had not gained at all, but had simply kept step with that of the province of Quebec, which is the standard province of confederation, and that if we had not gone back, at any rate we had not gained. This showed conclusively that Ontario had not retained her natural increase of population during the ten years of the National Policy, from 1881 to 1891. What was the case in the other provinces? Manitoba had gained two members, showing that notwithstanding the wealth that we had freely poured out, and the temptations we had held to Europeans to come and settle on the broad prairies of the North-west, Manitoba was only able in ten years to gain two additional representatives, whereas in five years, under the old regime, she had gained one. How was it with the maritime provinces? Nova Scotia was not able to retain her population, and her contingent will come back after the next election one member less. New Brunswick will have two members less, and the tight little Island of Prince Edward—the little gem that lies out in the gulf by itself, and there is no finer agricultural country on the continent—will have to content itself with a reduction of one member. This shows that in the aggregate the eastern provinces by the sea have lost population, since they are not able to retain the number of members they formerly had. British Columbia was entitled to no increase.

As regards the province of Ontario what are the facts? Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of the building up of our population by the National Policy, and point with pride to the growth of some of the larger cities. But, Sir, Toronto has grown at the expense of the smaller towns and villages, within forty miles of it, and the only part of Ontario where the population has increased is the new district of Algoma, and there the increase is due to the development of its mining industry. What was then the action taken by the Government. They were in the position that they had to redistribute some of the constituencies in order to equalize the representation, whereas if the National Policy had done all they promised it would, instead of diminishing they would have required to increase the representation. Not only would the older constituencies have retained their representation, but they would have increased it. Two of the older constituencies, however, in the Niagara peninsula, had to be blotted out, and their record, dating back to the early history of the province disappears. By the action the Government took they might just as well have passed an act declaring that the part of my constituency attached to North Brant should not vote at all. For what reason? In the constituency to which they are attached, candidates of the party opposite, during the last two general elections, lost in both cases their deposit; and for fear the Liberal element of that constituency

should not continue to do that sort of thing, we find the Government adding to it a section of another riding, which gave 350 of a Liberal majority at the last general election. They did this to enable the electors to still make sure that any candidate of hon. gentlemen opposite who would have the temerity to again test that constituency, would again lose his deposit. They might just as well have passed an act declaring that Conservatives and Liberals alike added from North Wentworth should be deprived of the right to vote because they were put where their votes could not be successfully used.

But, Mr. Speaker, you may change the outlines of a constituency, you may readjust your boundaries, but you cannot control the free and independent electors who reside within those boundaries. The population of Ontario, be they Conservatives or Liberals, have at least minds of their own; and I shall be very much mistaken if the Government do not find that their policy has done nothing to strengthen them in the estimation of the best thinking

men of the Niagara peninsula. You may change these boundaries and adjust these schemes, but the experience of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1882 indicates that the people are free in their choice and will suit themselves when the time comes.

I apologize to the House for the time I have taken, and I thank the House for the kind attention it has given my remarks. We are willing to bear all the necessary burdens in order to pay our debts and maintain our credit and good name. We are willing to bear the taxation imposed upon us to meet the necessary expenditure of this country; we are willing to give our native industries every benefit of that protection up to that extent; but for myself I am not willing that any man should deliberately put his hand into my pocket and take more or less money out in order to bolster an institution that has not backbone enough to stand on its own legs, and I shall be found voting for the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford.