

springing up rapidly there. I presume the hon. gentleman, with his usual candor, will acknowledge that such is the case.

Mr. PATERSON. I will; but I desire to explain.

Mr. PLUMB. I have the floor.

Mr. PATERSON. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman on one point. I did not say the manufacturers were suffering. What the hon. gentleman says is true. I said they were suffering as far as their export trade is concerned. That is what my latter argument is based on.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman said they were handicapped.

Mr. PATERSON. I said they were handicapped in their export trade.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman said they were handicapped and suffering, not only in their export trade, but that our ruinous Tariff had paralysed our industries.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not use those words at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He never said so.

Mr. PLUMB. Then the hon. gentlemen did not mean what he said.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes, I did.

Mr. PLUMB. It is not my fault if the hon. gentleman did not mean what he said.

Mr. PATERSON. You were making too much noise to hear what I said.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman said that he wanted to see our manufacturing interests developed.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. PLUMB. He said that under the favorable protection of the late Government, manufactures were flourishing and prosperous. The hon. gentleman contrasted the condition of things up to 1878 with their condition now, and the whole gist of his argument was, that we were more prosperous under that condition of things than we are now. The hon. gentleman cannot escape. That was the whole drift of his argument. I appeal to the House and the common sense of the country to say whether the hon. gentleman is correct. The hon. gentleman must be very badly driven into a corner when he opens a discussion with such a statement. The credulity of his party must be exceedingly great when they permit the hon. gentleman to make such statements without proof. I can only say I am perfectly astonished that, with the evidence before him everywhere, he should now seek to escape from the fact that the country is prosperous in all directions, and endeavor to prove that the present Tariff has paralyzed trade. I am astonished that, with the evidence before him, the evidence of his own senses everywhere, he now seeks to escape from the fact that the country is prosperous in all directions, and he endeavors to prove that the Tariff, as imposed by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, has paralyzed and injured trade. The hon. gentleman throughout his whole argument uses another specious plea which is very common to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. He speaks of the Tariff as if the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches had imposed the whole of it. He says that there is a Tariff of 30 per cent. or 35 per cent. upon brass manufacturers, in speaking of steam machinery; he says that the Tariff has increased the price just so much, but who is responsible for at least half of that, and perhaps more? I remember perfectly an hon. gentleman who did me the honor to visit my constituency to harangue the bucolic element who came there, and whom he thought would listen to his arguments—I had no opportunity to reply at the time he attempted to tell them that the Tariff on cotton had raised the price over 30 per cent. My hon. friend the late leader

of the Government, in the strongest charge he could bring against the existing Tariff, when he was using every possible argument against it, stated—and we may always make a little allowance for the exaggerations used in the heat of debate—he stated that our Tariff was an average increase of 5 per cent. over 17½ per cent. Cottons may be increased on the average by 7½ per cent.; if so, that cannot increase the price to 30 per cent., unless by some *locus pocus* the manufacturers have been enabled, through the misrepresentations of the hon. gentleman opposite, and through the misrepresentations of the press which echo their views, to receive a higher price and to be sustained in it. The hon. gentleman speaks of the decrease in the exports of pig iron. There was no pig iron manufactured in this country until within a very short time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; in Londonderry and Three Rivers.

Mr. PLUMB. That at Three Rivers is a new industry of about three years date, but even then that industry was paralyzed, and they were not able to do any large business until they were protected by the present Tariff. It is a good sign that these works are prosperous. We are using their iron. There is a prohibitory Tariff in the United States, and it is not at all likely, and the hon. gentlemen cannot expect, that we will export pig iron to England. I think the whole of his argument is based upon a succession of similar fallacies, which are intended, not so much for the ear of this House as for his supporters outside. The hon. gentleman knows that the instant propositions of that kind are made in this House they will be met, and he knows that the delusive manner in which he has put these figures will be very easily exposed. I have not the figures present, I did not intend to answer him on that point, but I observe that, in order to increase the list of articles which have fallen off in exportation, he has made use of some very paltry items where the whole trade is scarcely anything, or amounts to but a few thousand dollars. On the article of drugs I believe the whole export is but \$79. The exports of drugs and medicines, so far as I can see, that are not of our own manufacture, amounts to \$365. But a detailed answer to the hon. gentleman can only be made by reference to the books themselves. I say, again, that it is a little extraordinary that the hon. gentleman argues that the effect of this Tariff is to decrease our export trade, when the very articles which are coming into us are sent to us from a country which is so largely protective. A great many of those articles from the United States are largely protected. The hon. gentleman speaks of a great increase in our exports. He says that he does not care where that increase arises. Well, that is of a piece with everything that is said by hon. gentlemen on the other side. He does not care whether the produce that is raised in this country is taken into the United States, and a duty averaging 30, 40 or 50 per cent. paid upon it. He does not care whether that is owing to the exigencies of our trade and the balance of our trade, as it was during the Administration which that hon. gentleman supported for five years, and which he is endeavoring to get back into power. He does not care whether the farmer is compelled to go there, or whether he has the English market opened to him, or whether he buys under a tariff at all. The hon. gentleman's arguments are all of the same character; all he desires to do is to make a point against the present Government, and I believe in that he has signally failed. But I say again, and I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact, that we see, from the course pursued by the hon. gentlemen, that their policy is one of undying hostility to the manufacturing interests, one of undying hostility to the National Policy. We will hold the hon. gentleman to his utterances, because we believe that those utterances are made in consequence of an agreement among the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, and therefore, that he