

the Government adopted by Parliament. I know, Sir, that, in the estimation of some of my friends opposite, I have undertaken a herculean task.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hon. gentlemen opposite say hear, hear. In view of the predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1879, with reference to this policy—when I am now able to submit, after an experience of less than three years, its results—I trust that I will be able to convince them even, that this policy has had much to do with bringing about the present state of affairs in this country. I regret, Sir, that I was not in the House either on Tuesday or yesterday afternoon (circumstances preventing my being present) to hear the speeches delivered by the hon. members for South Brant and Norfolk. I recollect, last year, that the hon. member for South Brant led up, as on the present occasion, a discussion of the policy of the Government, and the effect of the Tariff, in advance of the statement of the Budget Speech, and I called the hon. gentleman's attention, on that occasion, to the fact that it was not usual to pursue such a course, the hon. member told me we had been so long in bringing down the Budget, six weeks having elapsed, he could wait no longer; yet, on the present occasion, though not a fortnight had elapsed since the opening of Parliament, the hon. member was again to the front anticipating, as on a former occasion, the discussion that usually takes place after the financial statement. Sir, he was followed yesterday by the hon. member for Norfolk on the fiscal policy of the Government. I could not help thinking that the hon. member for Centre Huron may, by-and-bye—when the time arrives so much hoped for by hon. gentlemen opposite, when the present Opposition shall change places with us—find some rivals for the position he formerly occupied; but the hon. members for South Brant and Norfolk—provided they adopt our policy which, as I have stated on previous occasions, is the only course for them to pursue in order to get on this side of the House—will have the advantage of the hon. member for Centre Huron, because they can point to the emphatic, impressive and admirable speeches they delivered some three or four years ago in favor of a protective policy. Sir, the position of the Government, when they introduced what is called the National Policy, was a difficult one, because they had a difficult question to deal with. There was necessarily a great deal of speculation with respect to the effect of the adoption of that policy even in the minds of some of its friends and advocates. There was a question in their minds, as well as in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, whether, if it proved to be a protective policy, we would obtain sufficient revenue; if, on the contrary, it proved to be a revenue Tariff, whether it would give the protection to the industries of the country which was demanded by the people, as evidenced by the elections of 1878; and necessarily we, who had given careful consideration to this matter, had to speculate to a certain extent with respect to its effect. But, Sir, in 1880, the opinions that we had entertained in 1879 were being confirmed by the experience of the nine months. In 1881, they were still stronger, because evidence had accumulated to show that our position was the correct one; and, to-day, we stand in an impregnable position with respect to the results of the Tariff, both for protection and revenue purposes. I recollect very well last Session, when I made my financial statement, that it showed an apparent deficit of \$1,500,000, and when I explained that, under the operation of the Tariff, it would have provided just about sufficient to meet the necessary expenditure had we not in the year previous received a large revenue on articles consumed in the year following, hon. gentlemen opposite laughed at that idea, declaring that the plea would not avail, and that the Government had a deficit to

announce to the House. But what I stated was the fact. It shows that the producing power of the Tariff, as far as revenue is concerned, was such as to give us, if we had the \$700,000 collected in the year previous for goods consumed in the following year, and \$500,000 or \$600,000 of Excise calculated in the year previous in anticipation of the change of Tariff on goods consumed in the year following, there would not have been a deficit of more than \$200,000, showing how accurately and how fully the estimates of the Government were borne out. But, to-day, we stand here not with any doubt as to its revenue-producing power, but with evidence of the last year before us, with the Public Accounts and statements on the Table of the House, showing not only no deficit of even \$200,000, but, instead of an estimated surplus of \$2,000,000, there is a surplus of \$4,132,743 in the Treasury, as the result of its operations. Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition, in discussing the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne (I regret he is not present, and we all regret the circumstances which render his absence necessary), said, that he could not understand why it was that the Government had asked the people to bear the additional burden of the surplus, unless it was after the manner of the man who was found carrying a heavy rail up a hill, and, when asked why he was doing it, said it was for the pleasure he would enjoy in laying it down. Now, Sir, in this connection permit me to draw a contrast between the effect that was produced by the increase of \$3,000,000 taxation imposed by my predecessor, in 1874, and the proposition in 1879. In 1874, my hon. predecessor asked Parliament to give him, in addition to what he could collect from the then existing Tariff, \$3,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on the public works, completing the Pacific Railway, and other engagements which the Government was bound to carry out. What was the result upon the revenue? In the year following a response was given in the shape of an increase of something like \$2,000,000 paid into the Treasury; but, from 1875 down to 1879, the average amount received from the Tariff then existing was but \$12,500,000 per year. Had there been no change in the Tariff in 1879, the receipts from Customs would have been but a little over \$12,000,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, I will not simply say yes, but will prove it as I proceed. Sir, what caused this? It was caused by the general depression in the country. You may impose a burden upon a man, but unless you give him food and sustenance he will be unable to carry that burden. The hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) imposed burdens on the people, but gave them no food to supply them with strength to carry them. What was the condition of our people at that time? With the prices of all the manufactures and products of the United States at that time exceedingly low, owing to the condition of that country then, the Tariff that he submitted was food and encouragement for the foreigner, but both were denied to our own people. When our people asked the hon. gentleman for bread, he gave them a stone; and the result was that, all over this country, factories were either closed or working at half time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; you must prove that too.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, I can prove that also, because I saw some of them closed myself, and hon. gentlemen opposite asked me within a year after why we had not re-opened them. Men were without employment, knocking at the doors of Parliament, knocking at the doors of the Department of Public Works, asking for employment, and none could be got. It could not be expected, under these circumstances, that men could respond to the requirements of the hon. gentleman's Tariff; for if they had not the means they could not buy either the products of