

and taxing it. What did the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite do? Why, Sir, it took the raw material of a large proportion of the manufacturers of this country out of the free list and imposed duties upon it, and by the imposition of these duties reduced the advantage that the manufacturers had in this market as well as in the foreign market; and the very fact, Sir, that the Minister of Finance said, with reference to the foreign trade, that a drawback would be given equal to the amount of duty paid by the manufacturers on the raw material entering into the manufacture of goods, shows that he knows that the imposition of duties on the raw material wipes out the protection that is enjoyed by the manufacturers to that extent. Take the manufacturing institutions in my own city, as well as in other cities in the Dominion, and their coal is taxed that used to be free, their iron is taxed that used to be free, their bar iron is taxed at a greatly increased rate, boiler tubes have increased to 25 per cent., their boiler plate has been taxed, and every department of brass goods—to them the raw material—has been taxed, so that they are actually to-day in a worse position than they were before. What is true with regard to them is true with reference to the manufacturers of agricultural implements and many others of this country, and with the exception of a few industries to which the Government have given special favors the manufacturers of this country would be in a better position, I believe, under a 17½ per cent. Tariff with their raw material free, than they are at the present time. Let us look, for instance, to this same question of crockery. In 1876, under a 17½ per cent. Tariff, with gold at 113½ in the United States, the manufacturers of these goods could find a ready sale and good prices for all they could make. But let us see what the hon. gentlemen did with reference to crockery. In 1876 there was imported of crockery into this Dominion \$430,888 worth. In 1881 there was imported into this country \$439,029 worth, or \$9,000 worth more of crockery from foreign markets in 1881 than in 1876. Now, Sir, what are the facts? The hon. the Finance Minister has raised the Tariff on crockery to 30 per cent., and yet there have been imported \$400,000 of these goods. What is the result? The purchaser of crockery not only pays that 30 per cent. on the crockery imported from other countries—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Do you mean on all crockery?

Mr. PATERSON. No, on white ware. The hon. gentleman will agree with me that the Trade and Navigation Returns, not being exactly classified in each year, it is difficult to understand what they mean. I think, however, I said white crockery, and that I will have been found to have said it.

Mr. PLUMB. Say it slow, over again.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know whether it could be said slow enough to enter the cranium of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). I find iron, stoneware, &c.,—that is, cream color—classified in 1881, \$250,435, as being imported. Now, the serious fact with reference to that is that under the National Policy, that amount of crockery was imported on which we paid 30 per cent. more, and the people had to pay the manufacturers of crockery 30 per cent. on all the goods they turned out, or 30 per cent. more than if it had been on the free list. I am willing, and the Mackenzie Administration were willing to give, and did give, the manufacturers 17½ per cent. protection, and under that they prospered and improved for several years; and while we might help to give protection to that extent, I may say, that to go beyond that and impose higher duties is to make the people of this country pay a higher rate for protection than they should pay. I am one of those that believe in building

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

up the manufacturing industries of this country, and with a view of having that they must have some advantage, and that they cannot exist when they are young without such advantage. I have supported always and am now advocating such a view, and when the Reform party come back, effect will be given to that view. If a revenue could be raised on that, and if, at the same time, we could, by its operation, afford such protection to the manufacturers as they are fairly entitled to in the interests of the country, I should support them. But I say that when you give the manufacturing industries of this country a protection of 30 per cent., you are making the people pay more for that interest than it is worth. I am glad to see our sugar refineries opened. Our friends opposite speak as if it was a source of satisfaction to gentlemen on this side of the House to see our sugar refineries closed. Not so; it was no action of the Mackenzie Government that closed the sugar refineries. The Mackenzie Government did not open them, and the reason assigned by the Finance Minister of the Mackenzie Government for not doing so was that the manufacturers of sugar, the washers of sugar, or one at least—for that was about all there was—stated that it was necessary in order to bring that result about, that he should have an amount of protection that would bear unduly on the 4,000,000 of consumers; and the position the Finance Minister took, on looking at this question, was that he was bound, as the man entrusted with the financial interests of the people of this country, to consider the interests of the 4,000,000 consumers as equal to the wishes of one sugar refiner, and he said he could not see his way to do what that sugar refiner wanted and at the same time do justice to this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite did it, however; and what does the country pay for it? Last year the hon. Finance Minister said they paid 25 cents a hundred; but this year he says the country has paid nothing for the benefit. Let us see how that sugar calculation bears out, and the people of this country will be able to form some idea of what they are paying for opening the sugar refineries. In 1878, we imported 105,240,173 lbs. of sugar, on which there was paid into the Treasury \$2,515,823, a duty equal to \$2.39 per hundred; in 1881, we imported 135,126,176 lbs. of sugar, on which a duty was paid of \$2,438,857. Now, Sir, if the same average duty that was levied under the Mackenzie Administration had been levied on that 135,126,176 lbs. imported in 1881, there would have been paid into the Treasury \$3,229,515, instead of \$2,438,857, or \$790,658 more than was paid under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I am willing to admit that that figure is subject to a slight decrease, because many of the sugars brought in, in 1881, were for refining purposes, &c.—it might be alleged, did not possess the full weight of sugar; but the loss would be very slight, and there stands the fact of the loss of revenue. If the people got their sugar cheaper, it might be made up to them; but, calculations made in this House show that, while you lose that amount of revenue, the people are paying more for the sugar they consume. Now, let us see the effect of this? The people of the Maritime Provinces and the people of Ontario pay between them, on the articles of breadstuffs and coal, prime necessities of life, about \$800,000 per annum; under the arrangement of the sugar duties by the Mackenzie Government, we should have received from the 135,000,000 lbs of sugar imported, as much revenue as we have at the present time in the public coffers, and the people of this country would have free coal and free breadstuffs of all kinds. That shows what the country is paying for these sugar refineries. Then, Sir, with reference to the article of wood-screws, there was a duty of 17½ per cent. on them under the late Administration and a factory was in existence. Hon. gentlemen opposite raised that protection to 35 per cent., and yet there are more screws coming in now than there were