

of the farmers, the fishermen and the lumbermen of the country. Those have not been benefitted in many cases, they have been seriously injured, though looking at the general increase of our exports, there is no wonder that the great improvement in the home market, of which he speaks, has taken place. But, Sir, last of all, in talking of the cheapness of articles, the hon. gentleman has chosen to compare—whether correctly or not I am not in a position to say in all cases—the prices in 1878 and 1882. Now, Sir, that is wholly and entirely a false contention. The tendency of all textile manufactures, and of manufactures of all kinds, is to grow cheaper year by year. New inventions are being brought forward with the object of cheapening manufacture, and they would cheapen it if the hon. gentleman did not interpose with his coal taxes and other things calculated to destroy and interfere with the natural tendency of trade. All the time raw material ought to be getting cheaper, because the production is usually widening and cheapening, and new raw materials are constantly being brought into use. But all these facts the hon. gentleman entirely discards. He will not face the real question, which is not whether in this or that particular year things were cheaper, but whether things can be produced as cheaply here as they can be produced elsewhere; he entirely omits to take into account the pressure which his policy has produced on many of the most deserving classes of the community. He proposes, it is true, to relieve the fishermen of his native Province and of the Maritime Provinces, but what is he going to do for all those numerous class of people, such as clergymen, schoolmasters, clerks and others, whose incomes are in a great measure fixed. When he talks of the general prosperity I think that the hon. gentleman would do well occasionally to go through the streets of this very city. Then he would see that this general prosperity has not extended all over Canada as far as he could desire or we could desire. I think he will see many shops empty, many advertisements of properties for sale; and I can tell him that very recently, to my knowledge, some thirty properties were put up in this city for which a bid could not be obtained. Sir, we find too from the Census returns that the picture is not in all respects as the hon. gentleman would wish us to believe, although the information has in some cases been rather limited. I find that in the case of North Leeds the population has absolutely retrograded. I find the same in the case of Frontenac, of Lennox, East Hastings, West Northumberland, East Durham, West Durham, also of the good town of Niagara, which is becoming small by degrees and beautifully less under the fostering care of its honorable representative. I also find South Wentworth and Halton in the same condition, and an equal number of counties which are marked as almost absolutely stationary. I cannot speak of the state of things in St. John, but the member for the city and county of St. John, and other gentlemen who are well acquainted with that locality, tell me the state of things there is pretty much the same. In the west, in such towns as Belleville, Goderich, Mitchell, Stratford and Welland, I find the population is stationary or decreasing. I cannot say, therefore, that I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman that the result of his policy has been an universal and uniform improvement all over this country, and it is not to be wondered at when we will remember the amount of indirect taxes which is taken out of us as in the case of sugar, cotton and woollens, levied in one way or another, for the benefit of the favored few I have alluded to. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in thinking those burdens light. I think the people of Canada can bear them, but not without serious inconvenience. In looking over the whole position I am forcibly reminded of the times these hon. gentlemen profess to admire, the good times which existed 120 years ago—those good times, Mr. Speaker, when settlements were looked upon as the natural fields of plunder

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

for a few favorites, when Prince Edward Island was divided amongst some fourteen or fifteen families on certain conditions of settlement, which conditions of settlement, I believe, were never fairly fulfilled, and when Great Britain after a long struggle lost half this continent, and was nearly degraded to the position of a third-rate power. Now, Sir, when I look at these hon. gentlemen and remember their antecedents, when I recollect their past record and the consequences of their present acts, instead of feeling the glow of virtuous joy which that hon. gentleman the Minister of Finance experiences, I feel much more disposed to blush for the degradation of Canada now and to tremble for the consequences hereafter. I do not want to blame the hon. Minister too much, for after all he and his colleagues have only done what it is their nature to do, and we should not be too severe on their little weaknesses. My hon. friend was good enough to tell us our credit was high in England, that our securities ranked next to Consols. Have I quoted him aright?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Higher than any other colonial securities.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. He did not say that. He said next to Consols. I remember he used a similar statement before, which I took occasion to correct. No doubt Canadian securities rule high. That is a very satisfactory fact; but looking at the enormous sinking fund we employ purchasing our own securities, I am not so sure the prices are due to the causes the hon. gentleman assigns. I may remind him he would have done much better had he got rid of the sinking fund on the occasion of his last loan instead of adding to the very large amount we have occasion to employ in that way. Moreover, we have not been on the market of late, and when we come to employ \$1,250,000 in purchasing our own securities year after year, it is not a matter of great astonishment our bonds should run up one or two per cent. higher than those of other colonies which are every year putting securities on the market.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They have sinking funds too.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but they are always raising loans, and their sinking funds are not as large as ours. The hon. gentleman took occasion to say that he was going to disprove most completely the charge that his Tariff had in any way interfered with the importation of dry goods into this country, and selected with some skill a year—I think 1876—in which the imports of Great Britain had sunk to about \$40,000,000. I object altogether to the fallacious argument the hon. gentleman uses. His policy has been to compare years of extreme depression with years of rather remarkable prosperity. Now, I am willing to compare years of prosperity with years of prosperity and years of depression with years of depression and have nothing to fear in the comparison. Why could not the hon. gentleman have given us the imports from Great Britain in 1873-74-75 when our exports, though not as large as at present, were very considerable. He says he has not interfered in the slightest degree with our trade in Great Britain. Well, when our Tariff had some pretence to be a revenue Tariff and our exports were several millions less than they are to-day, I find that in 1873, we imported \$68,000,000 worth of goods from Great Britain; in 1874, \$63,000,000; in 1875, \$60,000,000, against an import of about \$43,000,000 the present year. He is very fond of having averages; let him carry his average a little further back; he will find the result will confirm what we have said. He will find that he has reduced the natural importation from Great Britain to the amount of something like \$25,000,000, if we take the extreme points. The hon. gentleman stated that the old Customs Tariff would have failed to produce sufficient revenue, but failed to produce