

that I should feel disposed to criticise him so much for relieving them to some extent, although it is a very curious argument in favor of a policy to take money out of one pocket and put it into another and call that granting relief to the people. But, Sir, I submit that, if he be right in redressing the injustice which he has laid upon the fishermen by his Tariff, there are other classes in this community who have a right to the same justice at his hands. If the fishermen are to have bounties, other classes of the community have a right to bounties too. The lumberman has a right to be indemnified for the increased cost to which this Tariff has put him. Why should one man receive a privilege more than another? Why should the maker of cotton cloth, the maker of woollen cloth be allowed to receive from one-third to one-half more than the fair market value of his article when he comes into competition with other goods made in other markets; and why should my agricultural friend not be allowed to receive one-third to one-half, or whatever the proportion may be, more than the absolute market value of every bushel of grain and every pound of beef, cheese and butter, that he may bring to market. I should like to know what reason the hon. gentleman can advance why he should not give bounties to that and the other class I have enumerated. Does he dare to say that the farmers are less deserving? Does he not know that on our farmers, more than on any other class, the whole prosperity of this Dominion depends, that above all other classes, except possibly the one class of fishermen, farmers have to dread and have to contend with foreign competitors, and how does he propose to help them in their fight with foreign competitors? He has weighted them down in every possible manner. He has added to the price of every article that they require to use. He has increased the cost of production of the articles they sell, and has done nothing whatever to advantage them in any shape or way. Sir, I say that whatever the hon. gentleman may think, he will find that farmers know as well as I do—I was going to say as well as he does—that the price of all the great staples which they produce has been, is, and will be, for many years to come, ruled by the price in the English and European markets, and that their real competitor is the American producer in fighting against whom this Tariff puts them at the highest disadvantage. Then, Sir, I proceed to ask, following the line of the hon. gentleman's argument, what has he done for the lumberman? To whom does he owe the surplus of which he boasts? The lumber industry has increased its exports \$12,000,000. It has enabled us to buy \$12,000,000 more of imports. Upon these imports he has raised those four millions. To whom does he owe more than he does to the lumbermen? Here, again, I prefer to go to the fountain head. I have tried to find out for myself what the opinion of the lumbermen of Canada may happen to be as to the merits of the hon. gentleman's Tariff, and I received, but one week ago, a letter from the head of a leading lumbering firm which I shall take the liberty of reading to this House. This gentleman says:

"I know that our timber costs us from \$1 to \$1.50 per thousand more than it did four years ago. The larger portion of this may be attributable to increase of duties, yet some, unquestionably is due to the increased demand for labor, owing to the return of activity in the lumber business of the United States. During the past summer wages were about \$2 per month higher, owing partly to increased expenditure of the men upon themselves and their families, owing to the ext a price of clothing, &c. The expenditure in the woods has been considerably higher, partly owing to the same cause, partly owing to the advance in the price of standing timbers. That the present Tariff presses very heavily upon the lumber trade, is a fact beyond dispute, while the profits derived from it are, on an average of years, much below a fair return on the capital invested. Everything the lumberman uses in his business, iron, steel, saws, woollens, cotton, pork, flour, oats, corn and lots of other things, are subject to an almost prohibited tax, although in many cases, you cannot obtain in Canada, articles of the quality you want. For instance, I sent the other day, an order for a few hundred dollars' worth of saws, on which I shall have to pay 36 per cent. duty, in order to build up one or two factories in Canada who cannot make the quality of saws I require."

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

Sir, I deem it unnecessary to add one word to that statement. It is made by a man of many years' experience in the trade, thoroughly familiar with its working, and to my certain knowledge, eminently capable of calculating what the Tariff actually does cost the lumber trade; and I ask again what will the hon. gentleman do to protect and encourage the lumberman, to whom, more than to any other class, he owes the surplus of which he and his friends boast so loudly. Then, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman done for the workingman. His vaunts are loud enough; but, let me ask, has the hon. gentleman taken any steps to protect the workingman? Has he tried to secure them from foreign competition? Are they less worthy, the workingmen of Canada, of being secured against foreign competition? Are Canadian men less worthy of protection than Canadian cotton and woollen goods? Why, Sir, these gentlemen will not condescend to take the least ordinary precautions to secure the health and safety of the workingmen. Sir, that was a most suggestive paragraph in the Speech from the Throne:

"The Report of a Royal Commission issued to enquire into the question of factory labor, and the best means of promoting the comfort and well-being of the workingman and his family, without undue interference with the development of our manufacturing industries, will be laid before you."

The paternal Government are to take pains to secure the comfort and happiness of the workingman and his family, always provided that it is not to be done by interfering with the profits of their masters—the manufacturers. Sir, one good thing these hon. gentlemen have done—late in the day, and I do not hold it by any means an excuse for their previous neglect—but they did issue a commission to enquire into the condition of factory children in the factories he has alluded to, and I am bound to say, that so far as I am able to perceive, these gentlemen to whom the duty was entrusted, have done it honestly and well. But, what do these gentlemen report to us? They tell us, Sir, in the first place, that they have found much inconvenience and delay in obtaining information, that in some instances they were told by manufacturers that they knew their own business, and that the Government should not dictate whom they should employ, or interfere in matters of trade. The Commissioners report states:

"The employment of children and young persons in mills and factories is extensive and largely on the increase, the supply being unequal to the demand, particularly in some localities, which may partially explain why those of such tender years are engaged. As to obtaining, with accuracy, the ages of the children employed, we found some difficulty, inasmuch as the employer has no record thereof, having no interest or obligation in so doing, consequently in order to ascertain their ages they were interrogated either by one of the Commissioners or some one in the factory. We are sorry to report that in very many instances the children having no education whatever, could not tell their ages; this applies more particularly to those from 12 years downwards, some being found as young as eight and nine years."

The Commissioners go on to describe a state of things in which

"the children invariably work as many hours as adults, and if not compelled are requested to work over-time when circumstances so demand, which has not been unusual of late in most lines of manufactures. The appearance and condition of the children, in the after part of the day, such as may be witnessed in the months of July and August, was anything but inviting or desirable."

Now, I say this, the Government has committed a great and grave fault, that they have been guilty of very serious laches in allowing such a state of things to exist without, till now, having made the faintest or remotest attempt to remedy it. They knew right well, because some of them at least are not ignorant of what has transpired in other countries, that when factory labor has been stimulated; as they proposed themselves to stimulate it under this Tariff, the greed of parents and employers has always resulted in cases of the grossest tyranny and oppression to the unfortunate young children employed in those factories; and yet knowing that, they have allowed three years and a-half to