

well aware that they are made under a very high protective system, enhancing the cost of labor and of everything involved. I will not enter into this subject further than to say, that the circumstance that America exports to Great Britain an enormous value of raw cotton and does not export the manufactured article, while Great Britain exports enormously of it, proves that the cottons that are made in the United States are inordinately high priced. Great Britain is able to take the manufactured material across the water and to return some portion of it manufactured to the United States, and send it to all the neutral markets, while the United States is utterly unable to compete with her in those markets. That shows that the comparison of the hon. gentleman proposes to make is not very satisfactory, even if his statement were correct that we do pay only 5 to  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. more than the American mill prices. Nor is it very satisfactory even considering the figures. My hon. friend from Gloucester pointed out that our imports of raw cotton, last year, were 16,000,000 lbs. Now, I assume that 2,000,000 pounds would represent a liberal allowance for cotton used as waste and otherwise than in the mills. I assume that 14,000,000 pounds went into Canadian production. The product of 16,000,000 pounds in various forms was probably worth, at Canadian mill prices, \$5,000,000, and if there were  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. only in excess of United States mill prices, it is clear that there would be \$350,000 paid by the people of this country for the domestic cotton product on in excess of the cost in the United States. According to the hon. gentleman's own statement, this will prove the fallacy of that statement. But it is enormous. One proof my hon. friend from Gloucester has already referred to, that is the circumstance that enormous importations have been made of cotton goods at an enormous duty of from 26 to over 40 per cent. The Canadian supply was unequal to the demand, and it is impossible to suppose that the Canadian goods were kept so far below the duty here as the hon. gentlemen would suggest; when you find a range of duties from 26 to over 40 per cent., and the domestic supply unequal to the demand, you find the answer in these facts alone to the hon. gentleman's arguments, even if we were to have no more facts to deal with. The cotton imports to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, show these facts. I will not enter into the details of these various imports, but I will point out that the grand totals indicate that an average rate of duty such as proves the general fact to be that what we import costs us over 30 per cent. in duty. The grand totals of both articles denominated grey and bleached, &c., and denims, drills, &c., indicate an import from the United States and Britain combined, of 18,645,613 yards, at a cost of \$1,928,499; average cost per yard of all these goods was 9.15 cents, and the average duty was 30.36 per cent. On the smaller importation, gingham and plaids, the average duty was 32 per cent. over; wadding, &c., over 27 per cent.; knitting yarn, over 27 per cent.; wax, on beams, 34 per cent., so I am quite sure I am correct in stating that the rate of duty which we pay on all such cotton goods we import exceeds 30 per cent., irrespective of freight and charges.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. On all cotton goods?

Mr. BLAKE. No; not on all cotton goods, but on all cotton goods of those classes which are manufactured in the country. Of course, when the hon. gentleman proposes to include prints which we do not make, for the purpose of proving some illusory statement as to the advantages of his Tariff in this particular, he is welcome to repeat that calculation for the twenty-fifth time, and it will have as much weight as it did the twenty-fourth time. But I am dealing with the classes of goods manufactured here as compared with the importation of the same classes of goods, and I am averring as a general proposition, that these goods that we buy in Canada cost us approximately, including the duty

and the cost of transport, within a shade of the cost of analogous goods which are manufactured abroad. While the hon. gentleman dealt in generalities, it was of course difficult to grapple with him. He said cotton goods are sold within 5 or  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of United States mill prices; but when we ask him to bring down the evidence on which he makes that highly important statement, he brings down a letter from Mr. A. F. Gault, and that is the only evidence on this particular subject on which the hon. gentlemen based his statement. The hon. gentleman is asked to bring down all the evidence, and that is all the evidence he can afford us. It is unfortunate that the hon. the Finance Minister ventured a statement of that kind upon that paper without having made further enquiry, without having obtained information from other quarters—however respectable, and I am the last to impugn the respectability of the quarter to which he applied—from opposite points of view, from those interested in other phases of the question than that in which Mr. Gault is chiefly interested, full information in order to enable him to reach the bottom of the question, and see how far Mr. Gault's views accorded with the actual views of the case. That letter is a very important contribution to the literature of this question. It deals broadly with a number of propositions which have formed the subject of discussion in various ways. Amongst other things it deals with the cost of the raw material. The prices of raw cotton says Mr. Gault, such as is generally used in Canadian Mills, run as follows: 1878, 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ c; 1879, 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ; 1880, 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ; 1881, 13 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents per lb., thus indicating a range of prices which are important when we deal with the cost of the manufactured article. This statement indicates a rise of 2 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents between 1878 and 1881, but it admits a slight fall of one  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a cent between 1879 and 1881; and I ask therefore the attention of the House to the fact that the raw material was rather cheaper in 1881 than in 1879. Dealing with the cotton manufacture, we may look at the public statements as they appear in the Trade and Navigation Returns, and see what was the valuation as to the actual cost of the cotton imports. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee) gave us that statement the other day, but in this connection it is worth while repeating it. In 1878, according to Mr. Gault, it was 10.50 cents, while, according to the Trade and Navigation returns, it was 10.70 cents. In 1879, according to Mr. Gault, it was 13.50 cents, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, 10.12 cents. In 1880, according to Mr. Gault, it was 13 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, 11.30 cents. In 1881, according to Mr. Gault, it was 13 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, it was 10.65 cents; making for the fiscal year a slight fall between 1878 and 1881, and a slight rise between 1879 and 1881, and showing absolute values far below those Mr. Gault gives, except for the year 1878, with which it is desired to make a comparison with the year 1881, the Trade and Navigation Returns give 10.65 cents, as against 13.25 cents by Mr. Gault, or an excess of nearly 25 per cent. We take another test. The quality of cotton used in Canadian factories is probably on an average inferior to the general standard of quality of middling uplands in the New York and Liverpool markets. Some may be used, perhaps, superior to that description, but probably all round it is an article inferior to that; but taking the standard quality of middling uplands in New York either for the cotton year or the calendar year, for I do not know from which Mr. Gault gives his figures, this is the result: the cotton year begins on 1st September and the quotations, are generally taken from that period. The average price of New York middling uplands for the year ending 31st August, 1878, was 11.23 cents; 1879, 11.17 cents; 1880, 12.32; 1881, 11.40 cents. There is thus no very material difference between 1878 and 1879, but I think it probable that Mr.