

that extent on their exports, they have been burdened in a like manner and to a proportionate extent on their much larger sales in our own country. It is idle in the face of these facts, and still more idle in the face of the money paid back to these manufacturers on their raw material used, to say that they have not been damaged by the duties on it. How has our foreign trade been affected by it? The Finance Minister and the country know that our foreign trade which we boasted of with some feelings of pride in 1878, has, largely through the imposition of duties on materials, been prevented from competing successfully with that of foreign countries. There is a reduction of over 25 per cent. A few more years of like decrease, and our exports of manufacturers will be a thing of the past. I have in my pocket the statement of one of the largest manufacturing concerns in my own town, giving me a detailed list of the enhanced cost of raw materials directly through the operation of the Tariff, amounting to over \$6,000, for the amount they used. Is not that a burden on our manufacturing industries? I do not often notice on our newspaper paragraphs, but I have seen one in the *Mail*, saying:

"If we remember right, and are not mistaken, Mr. Paterson, of Brant, made statements in the House as from a certain letter, which was afterwards found he had not quoted correctly, and the member from West Durham seems to be taking a leaf out of his book."

It does not remember right. I presume the statement they refer to is the statement I made on the public platform that I had figures to prove that that firm paid, through the enhanced cost of their saw material, over \$6,000 more last year than previously; a Conservative paper in my town stated the sum was only \$700, but a member of that firm, in a letter, said that my statement was in every respect true, that the duties had cost them over \$6,000, and that they had never told the Minister of Public Works that the amount was only \$700; but that they had told him they had claims to the amount of over \$700 for drawbacks, which shows that while the Government was able to make fair promises, it was quite as able to break them. I challenge contradiction on that point. Testimony might be given by manufacturers in other lines in cases where thousands of dollars have been imposed on them, and yet the hon. member for King's says the manufacturers have not been injured. They might say in one sense they were not injured, perhaps, and that they take the price out of the purchasers. The member for North Norfolk stated that the enhanced cost of agricultural implements, owing to the duty on raw materials, was something like \$2 each. But, besides, hon. gentlemen opposite have lost sight of the fact that less material was put into those machines at present, and that while the price may not have been increased, had it not been for the enhanced duty, the competition and improvements in machinery would have enabled the manufacturers to sell those implements cheaper than before. It stands true that they have suffered meanwhile, or one other thing has happened, that is they have taken the enhanced price out of the consumer. The proposition of the hon. member for St. John is fully borne out. I believe the Tariff has been an injury to the manufacturer in part, the consumer in part, because the manufacturer has borne part of the loss himself, and has been forced to put part of the loss on the consumer. Let us see how this affects the consumer. I take the blacksmiths for instance. In the year 1871 there were, according to the Census, 10,213 men employed in the trade. They have been vastly increased since then through the increase of population. How are they affected by this Tariff—the extra tax on them averaging about 12½ per cent. over what it was under the late Tariff, or \$12.50 on every \$100 worth of material they use? Either they pay this tax or it comes out of their customers. Take carpenters and joiners. There were 5,408 in 1871, and no doubt there is double the number at present. What has been

the effect on them. We see that the carpenters are on a strike.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. That is exactly the sound I expected to receive from gentlemen who impose heavy burdens on those men, and refuse to remedy them; such derision is quite appropriate with the course they have pursued. Who will say they have not reason to strike; that, as far as the Tariff is concerned, the hon. Finance Minister has not given them reason to strike. As the hon. member for St. John has pointed out that as far as these men are concerned they have reason to demand increased wages; if they cannot get them any other way, they are not to be blamed for taking the steps they did. Each carpenter has to buy his own set of tools, and those in the trade know how large a thing this is to one of these mechanics. What has been the effect of this Tariff? Tools are raised from 17½ to 30 per cent.; hinges, from 17½ to 30 per cent.; screws, from 17½ to 35; bolts and nuts, from 17½ to 35; tacks and finished nails, 17½ to 35. I suppose if I were to say that \$100 is the average cost of a kit of carpenters' tools, I should not be out of the way. This gives an increased tax of \$12.50 to be paid by the carpenter. Let the hon. Minister show what has been the effect of the duty on these articles that are being imported into the country in larger quantities than ever before. Will he say their cost is not enhanced or take refuge in the subterfuge that things are no higher now than they were formerly. But admitting that, how can he say they would not be sold much cheaper if the duty were off. Take coopers, of whom 3,442 were employed in 1871. You find the same relative increase to tin and sheet iron workers, of whom there are three or four thousand, in the same catalogue. Mark you these taxes imposed on the artizan are not all they have to pay. I am not speaking of outside subjects, with reference to the clothes they wear or other goods they consume, but simply of the products of iron. Hon. gentlemen opposite feel disposed to say there has been no increase in reference to the Tariff. I have in my hand a circular issued by certain hardware, harness and saddlery dealers.

Mr. PLUMB. Name.

Mr. PATERSON. There is more than one name, there are the names of all the leading dealers in the Province of Ontario, and they say: "That in consequence of the great advance in the cost of all classes of goods, and the increase on custom goods prices are advanced from 15 to 30 per cent., with a prospect of a still further advance." This circular is dated 29th October, 1879, six months after the new Tariff came into operation. The articles consumed by the people, if produced in the country, must mean enhanced prices to the consumer. I have no desire to detain the House further. This amendment is one to develop the manufacturing industry. Under the present Tariff the Londonderry iron works remain solitary in their glory, unable to supply the trade. This proves conclusively that their tariff bears on the manufacturing interests of the country, and through them on the consumers. I share in the opinion expressed in the resolution that an increased burden has been placed upon the manufacturers who import under the operations of this Tariff. That being the case, the Tariff having proved utterly inoperative for good and powerful for evil, I would ask the House to allow the proposition of the hon. member for St. John to pass, that we may give the sewing machine manufacturers, the foundry and machine men, the agricultural implements and carriage makers—give to over one-half the manufacturing industries of this country—a fair share of protection which ought to be given to them by taking off the duties on their raw material, and placing this raw material on the free list.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is one advantage we possess on this side of the House when my hon. friend from