

So a manufacturer, making steam engines and boilers for export, if he brought in his brass goods from the United States, would have remitted to him the duty he paid on them in the shape of drawback, but having to pay an equal amount to the Canadian manufacturer, he is not allowed a cent of drawback in respect to that. So the House will see how the manufacturer reaps a disadvantage; and the result is, that this system of drawbacks has failed to relieve the difficulty that Ministers themselves saw must necessarily overtake the export trade of manufactured goods. I know no other way by which Ministers can learn a lesson of wisdom than by studying the facts presented to them, which should cause them to depart from their system of hampering the industries of this country. Return to a sounder and newer Tariff, let the industries stand on their own merits, giving no advantage other than such as will come to them in a legitimate way through the revenue Tariff, which, when in force, afforded to manufacturers in many cases better protection than they enjoy at the present time—at all events, affording them all the advantage they have any right to ask that the people of this country should concede to them. As illustrating the operation of the Tariff, let me give hon. gentlemen opposite an instance or two. I took the trouble to ascertain some facts from a large manufacturer in my own town, and I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that there is not a manufacturer of any size or importance there who is not my warm personal and political friend. I have to tell them that, such being the case, as a matter of course they are the open and avowed opponents of the present occupants of the Treasury Benches, and therefore all the manufacturers cannot be their friends, at all events they are not found in my town. Why should they? With the exception of the sugar refining and one or two other industries, what have the manufacturers to thank the present Tariff for? Nothing certainly as regards the manufacturers in my own town. I have here the prepared statements of one of the largest firms, which shows that it paid last year by way of enhanced cost through the operation of this Tariff over and above what duty they would have had to pay under the Mackenzie Tariff on their raw material, the sum of \$6,096.04. That shows the extra cost they were compelled to pay on articles entering into their products for one year over and above the amount which they would have to pay had the old Tariff been in force, and that is a firm doing a large export trade. It is a firm which, before the present Government came into power, was doing an export trade with the uttermost ends of the earth—with Chili, Russia, and other countries; but their foreign trade is being slowly but surely crushed out under the operation of this Tariff—a result which is being brought about, whether through the inability of the Minister of Customs, I do not say, but I think it is. I have similar statements from other firms by word of mouth, though not prepared. One says the Tariff takes \$5,000 a year extra out of us; another says the amount reaches \$3,000. And what is the result of it? If the country were benefitted, if at home we were getting cheaper goods, we might view with some complacency the destruction of our export trade. But we have imports as great as ever, enhanced in price by the amount of duty, showing that we are paying enhanced prices on the same class of goods as are made at home, while, at the same time, there is a decreased export. I say these figures should challenge the attention of the hon. Ministers, and urge them, if possible, to devise some way by which this state of things may be remedied.

Mr. PLUMB. I am very glad to say that one of the earliest utterances from a prominent hon. member of the Opposition, who undoubtedly speaks with authority, shows that the undying hostility of his party to the fiscal policy adopted by this House continues as vigorous as ever. After the somewhat crude utterances of the late hon. leader of the

Mr. PATRICKSON (Brant).

Opposition, when he took a sad farewell of his constituents in Lambton, we were led to suppose that perhaps there might be some modification of the terms in which these hon. gentlemen have, from the beginning to the end, attacked, denounced and villified the policy of the Government. We can see, however, that the recess has stimulated my hon. friend, who has brought forward this resolution, to something more than his wonted energy, in the stentorian attacks which, from time to time, he is accustomed to make on the industries of this country. What is the scope of the hon. gentleman's argument? It is, so far as I am able to catch it, and I have endeavored to follow it very patiently, that because some items—and the hon. gentleman has very carefully made up his statements, since figures can be made to prove anything—of export have decreased within the last two years, that the National Policy is a failure, and is injuring our manufacturing interests. Well, I always supposed that we depended very much on our home trade, and that, though there might be a decrease in the exportation of some of our products, as the hon. gentleman says there is, the fact remains undisputed that the people are sufficiently prosperous not only to buy our own products, but also the imported products of other countries. We never pretended that we were going to build a Chinese wall about Canada, as hon. gentlemen opposite have so often asserted. We never pretended that we intended to take the course pursued by our neighbors on the other side of the border, of shutting out by our Tariff the manufactures of other nations, as hon. gentlemen opposite have so often said, and notably the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and who is master of a certain kind of specious argument. I give him credit for it. He is so notably a master of it that he has been utilized largely by his leader in the campaigns of this summer, which have not been very fortunate. But I say we never intended to shut out by our Tariff the manufactures of other countries.

Mr. ANGLIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear. We never intended to do so. We have said we intended to afford a reasonable protection to our own industries, which hon. gentlemen opposite refused to do. It is somewhat strange that in this argument we should be forced to meet the fact again, and the hon. gentleman is forced to meet it, that exports come to us from the country which has an almost prohibitory Tariff. Now, the hon. gentleman may take one horn of the dilemma or the other. Either the prohibitive Tariff of the United States does not prevent their exporting goods to us, or their Tariff does prevent their sending them. If it does not, if they do send us goods, it is an evidence that they are not handicapped by it. It is a fact, which every one knows, that one of the most sedulously protected countries in Europe sends to England large exports of iron manufactures, not small articles, but girders, and things of that kind, which they sell in the very heart of the iron district, underselling the traders in a Free Trade country. The hon. gentleman must take one side of the argument or the other. The hon. gentleman is, I believe, as the hon. gentlemen opposite generally are, greatly distressed that he has no longer the argument that the depression of trade in the country is so great as to force us to seek markets wherever we can find them, by sacrificing our manufactured goods. Within the last year or two they have been compelled to abandon the cry of famine and depression. Now, they are opening a discussion in this House upon an entirely different basis. The hon. gentleman says that in his town, the manufacturers have suffered. I have heard a very different story. My attention has been called to an article which appeared lately in the *London Free Press*, written from his place, and on which I might be able to lay my hands if necessary, stating that scarcely any town in Canada has more greatly benefitted by the Tariff than Brantford, that manufactories are