

then, which proves that the people of this country are paying not only the enhanced price on what is imported, but also on what is produced in the country. So with reference to woollens and cottons—there are excessive duties placed on them, there are more cottons and woollens being imported, and the inevitable result is that the people are paying more for their cotton and woollen goods—not only for what are imported, but for what are made in the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to deny this; but if a little common sense is brought to bear on this matter, it ought to make it patent to every business man in this House that where you do not produce as much goods as the country wants, you not only increase the price of the goods coming into the country, but enhance the price of those made in the country. To argue differently is to say that human nature does not avail itself of any advantages within its reach. The manufacturers of any class of goods will, as an effect of their human nature, take the advantage that the Tariff gives them, and if it enables them to demand 10 or 15 per cent. more for their goods than they could get without that Tariff, they will take that advantage and use it. When manufactures increase in the country, and when in any line of manufactured goods you produce more in the country than the country requires, then the imposition of the duties on foreign goods of a like nature does not necessarily raise the price of the goods made at home; because you have a home competition, and the home competition will bear down the price, and then you have reached the second stage of protection when you get cheaper goods—this fact being always borne in mind, that that is the result unless these manufacturers combine to restrict production and force up prices, which they can do under a high Tariff, and there a high Tariff is dangerous; or this other fact, that the raw material these manufacturers use being taxed, they must of necessity ask more for their manufactured products, or be content with a less margin; or the other result, which sometimes follows over-protection, and will not wholly be remedied by home competition, that the manufacturer does not keep up to the mark by sharp, keen competition from without as well as from within, is contented to work along with his old-fashioned machinery in his old-fashioned way, and does not bend his energies to forward his enterprises as best he might. With these exceptions, I admit that the proposition is correct; that when we produce more manufactured goods in the country than the country wants, the imposition of the duty does not necessarily enhance the price.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. The Finance Minister agrees with me and every business man in this House will agree with me. If a little common sense is brought to bear on the discussion of these matters, we will all know that such results must follow, but it is certain that there are not enough goods produced to supply the public wants; then the imposition of duties not only increases the price of the foreign goods imported, but it enhances the price of similar articles made in the country. I have endeavored to show that under the Mackenzie Administration, and their Tariff, the manufacturers were in existence in this country, that they were doing as well as many of them are doing now in comparison with how all other classes were doing; they had come into existence, and prospered equally in years gone by, as they have since the introduction of the National Policy. I come now to speak with respect to the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite, to another class, and another great industry, the agricultural industry. The hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Rykert), did me the honor to quote from another of my speeches in regard to agricultural protection, and in that matter he, as he has done

in other matters, misquoted, took out of their connection my words, so as to present them in a different manner from what my sentiments and expressions really were. In 1876 the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) moved for a Committee to enquire into our agricultural interests; there had been previously a Committee moved for and granted to enquire into our commercial and manufacturing interests. The hon. member for Centre Wellington had made that motion the previous year, I think, if not during the two previous years. He had previously obtained a Committee, but it failed to make a report. When he moved his motion in 1876, the hon. member for Lambton, then leading the Government, rose and objected to it on the ground that the hon. member had previously had a Committee granted, but nothing resulted from it, and he objected to granting the Committee, as he viewed the motion as a buncombe one. It was on that occasion I spoke, and advocated the appointment of that Committee. I said there might possibly be two sides to that question of agricultural protection. I said that my own opinion was, that a duty on wheat would not raise the price of wheat, because we grow a surplus and export it; but, nevertheless, there might be two sides to it. I thought it was desirable, when a Committee was asked for, to ascertain whether that was the case or not that a Committee should be granted. Mark what the hon. gentleman opposite said. The hon. gentleman, in quoting me, stated that I rose and said my party will make a mistake if they refuse to grant this concession, leaving the House to understand that I advocated duties on breadstuffs, and that I said my party would make a mistake if they did not grant that concession. That is the word you used, is it not?

Mr. RYKERT. Probably you heard what I said.

Mr. PATERSON. You do not deny it. I say it was with deliberate intent to misconstrue my language and deceive this House.

Mr. RYKERT. Will the hon. gentleman say I did not read his exact words?

Mr. PATERSON. I have asked you whether you used that word or not. I gave the opportunity of saying whether the word you used was concession.

Mr. RYKERT. I read your words exactly as they were.

Mr. PATERSON. Did you read from *Hansard*?

Mr. RYKERT. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not find fault when I ask the hon. gentleman what word he used. I understood him to use the word concession.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I called the hon. gentleman to order because he was addressing himself directly to my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman must address the Chair, and speak in the third person.

Mr. PATERSON. I quite understand, and will accept that hint from the leader of the Government. His is an example we sometimes find it difficult to follow, and if I have been a little unparliamentary, I know you, Mr. Speaker, will pardon me because the leader of the Government sometimes sets me that example. As I understood the hon. member for Lincoln, he read that I stated my party would make a mistake if it refused to grant concessions, while the word I used was Committee. The impression left is different in that case. I was advocating the appointment of a Committee to ascertain whether the duty on breadstuffs would benefit agriculturists. I said it would be a mistake if my party refused to grant the Committee, and, without egotism, I may say that at my request the leader of the Government withdrew his request and a Committee was appointed. I went on in that speech to say that possi-