

other employment than the one single thing they have been trained to do, they could perform only the most menial labor. In this way, they making use of a greater number of labor saving machines, we have to some extent counteracted the effect of the Tariff on the cost of producing our goods. Our annual product of goods could be manufactured under the old Tariff from \$12,000 to \$15,000 less than under the present Tariff."

I have a letter also from a firm in the town of my hon. friend the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson)—the firm of A. Harris, Son, & Co., in which the writer states that the Tariff is a damage to them of from \$5,000 to \$7,000 a year in the extra costs of materials. I have a letter to the same effect from the firm of Patterson Brothers, of Patterson, Ontario, which, like all the others, states that the Tariff has increased the price of their raw material and diminished their profits without reducing the price of their goods. If the position taken by these men is true, then the Tariff has not operated to their benefit as manufacturers; and I hold that it will be found that, with the exception of the sugar refiner, the cotton manufacturer and the woollen manufacturer, every manufacturing interest in the Dominion of Canada is placed in a worse position by this Tariff than it occupied under the revenue Tariff which preceded it. We were told by the hon. Minister of Customs that our manufacturers want higher duties. Well, it is certainly not the manufacturers I have alluded to who want higher duties on raw materials. He failed to tell us who wanted higher duties. Is it the Redpaths, who, under the operation of the present Tariff are making hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, and who are able to associate with the Rothschilds and the Vanderbilts? Is it the Valleyfield Cotton Company, who have declared a dividend of 50 per cent. on their capital? Is it those manufacturers who are running full time and are making enormous profits under the operations of this Tariff? I have heard of no others who want higher duties. We were also told by that hon. gentleman that our manufacturers are busy, because the purchasing power of the people is increased. I would like to ask him what would be the condition of affairs if we had a depression, if we had a failure of the harvest, if we had a year such as that of 1876, when we failed by over two millions of dollars in raising our own bread, if we had a period of depression all over the world, affecting the price of the products we sent to foreign countries, would he then be able to congratulate himself on the fact that the manufacturers were driven to fill orders, that the demand for goods was great, and that the people were able to buy freely? No, Sir. Then the condition of things would be as they were during the administration of my hon. friend from Lambton; then rigid economy would have to be practised by the people who were in trouble; and then the manufacturers would have to complain of diminished demand for their goods. The circumstances existing now are entirely different from those which existed during the three or four years previous to their advent to office. They flatter themselves that this is due to their policy. It is nothing of the kind. Have the good harvests been caused by the policy of the Government? Did the policy of the Government cause the depression here, or the depression that existed in the United States? Were the causes that produced that depression, that aggravated it, that continued it for five years, causes within the reach of this Parliament, or of any power in the Dominion of Canada? I hold that they were not. And to what is the revival due? Do hon. gentlemen opposite claim credit for the revival? Do they say that the National Policy has given us better harvests, that it has reached across the ocean and produced bad harvests in England, yielding us higher prices for our productions? Is it the National Policy which has reached across the border, and, in its potent influence, produced a revival of business there, which has re-acted on us. The assertion is absurd—the National Policy has produced none of these results. Well, Sir, there are certain facts on this

problem of what has produced the revival, which I may allude to shortly. I find that the net export of cereals and their productions—flour and meal—from Canada from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, amounted to \$48,767,000, and that the net export of the same articles in 1879, 1880 and 1881, amounted to \$44,978,000; the former being in five years, and the latter in three years. The annual average for the first period is \$9,753,000, and for the second period \$14,990,000; the average annual excess in the second period over the first being \$5,239,000. The excess for the three years since this Government came into power, amounts, therefore, to \$15,718,000. For the period extending from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, the export of butter and cheese, the produce of Canada, was \$31,860,960; for the three years, 1-79, 1880 and 1881, it was \$21,927,109; so that the annual average from 1874 to 1878 was \$6,372,193, and for the period between 1879 and 1881 was \$7,309,036, being an excess for the latter period over the former of \$936,843. I find, Sir, that in animals and their produce, the produce of Canada for the period from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, the exports were of the value of \$69,137,804; for the three years 1878, 1879 and 1881, they amounted to \$53,068,398, showing an annual average for the first period, of \$13,275,560, and for the second period, of \$17,698,466, being an annual excess for the latter period, of \$3,861,906. I find, Sir, that the exports of agricultural products, the produce of Canada for the period from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, were of the value of \$90,686,295, and for the period from 1879 to 1881 inclusive, they were \$63,911,119, being an annual average for the first period of \$18,137,259, and for the second period of \$21,083,706, being an annual excess for the latter period of \$2,946,447. I understood the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), in his remarks upon this question, the other day, to make a comparison between the last three years of the period covering the administration of the hon. member for Lambton and the three following years. I do not know whether I misunderstood him or not. He represented the exports of agricultural produce for 1876, 1877 and 1878 to amount to \$53,834,000, and that the exports for the following three years were some \$16,000,000 less. If I am incorrect I am open to correction.

Mr. HESSON. My remarks are before the House in the Debates. I said that, for 1871, 1872 and 1873, the last years of the administration of Sir John A. Macdonald, the exports of farms products, the produce of Canada, amounted to forty odd millions, as against \$53,000,000 during the last few years of the administration of the Mackenzie Government, the difference was some \$13,000,000. My object was to show that, although there was a larger export under the administration of Mr. Mackenzie, times were not better in consequence of that fact.

Mr. CHARLTON. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, as I thought a comparison had been made for a period subsequent to, and not before, the administration of Mr. Mackenzie. However, it will show this: that if the exports for 1871-72-73 fell \$16,000,000 short of those of 1876-77-78, that causes were operating at that time that produced the hard times that followed. Short harvests and diminished exports in due time produced their fruits. I find that for the three years 1876-77-78, as has been correctly stated by the hon. member for North Perth, the exports were \$53,834,000, or \$10,000,000 less than the exports for the years 1878-79-80. With regard to fisheries, the produce of Canada, I find the exports for the five years, from 1874 to 1878, were \$26,671,899, while for the three years 1879-80-81 they were \$20,876,242, giving an annual average for the first period of \$5,337,179, and for the second period \$6,792,080, being an annual excess of \$1,454,901. I further find on summing up those excesses of export that the average annual excess for the latter period was made up as follows: Net export of cereals, flour and meal, \$5,239,425;