yet in the same direction. The hon. the Minister of Customs replied to me, and I now desire to call attention to his reply, because, if he deigns to answer me to day, he will have to make a different answer. His answer on that occasion was as follows:—

"It is not my intention to enter upon a discussion of the subject with which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has dealt during the last hour and a-half. I think that probably the best answer to all his arguments with reference to the exports of the country will be found in a short paragraph on page 6 of the Trade and Navigation Returns, in which the Commissioner points out the important fact that, for the first time in the history of this country since Confederation, the exports have exceeded the imports by $1,421,711, and that they exceed also the value of the goods entered for consumption by $16,129,109."

The hon. gentleman answered my argument, which was analagous to the one I use to-day, by quoting what was found in the preface to the Commissioner's report, stating that there was an increase of exports over imports. But what answer will the hon. Minister of Customs give me to-day, when this same Commissioner of Customs tells us that, instead of there being an increase of exports over imports, there is absolutely a decrease of over $7,000,000? When I reminded him of the fact that I spoke of manufactured goods, he said that I made out a very good case for the Government, because I showed that the home market was now secured for the manufacturer. That statement was also made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who, at a later stage of the debate, replied to my arguments—and made as good a case for the Government, I am bound to say, as it was possible to make—but who failed, only because the facts and figures would not bear him out, and not from any want of ability. If he failed last year, what will his position be this year? Let us take some of the largest manufactures. There has been a great decrease in the export of pig iron, for instance. We have had a decreased export of 71,844 tons. No doubt the hon. member for Niagara will say that we have the home market; but what do the imports reveal? Why, that, in 1878, we only imported $488,824 worth, while, in 1881, we imported of foreign pig-iron, displacing our own, according to the hon. member's argument, 715,997 tons. Certainly, then, it cannot be contended that the Tariff has shut out foreign iron, or that it has given us the home market, according to the extent the exports have decreased. Then, in cottons there has been a decrease in the exports and an increase in the imports. In 1878, $7,104,517 worth of foreign cottons came into the country, while last year $10,244,465 worth came in. In boots and shoes we find that there has been a decrease in the exports of $134,618 worth. But have we the home market in consequence? In 1878, we imported $243,578 worth of boots and shoes, while last year we imported $105,592 worth. Therefore, I contend that the Tariff does not give our manufacturers a home market which they had not before; while it is so arranged that raw material is taxed, so that the manufacturer cannot produce goods as cheaply as he could formerly, he is, therefore, forced to charge us more for our goods, while at the same time he does not increase his home market. In machinery we exported $37,281 less in 1881 than in 1878, while we imported, in the latter year, $327,623 worth, against $1,047,549 worth in the former. Therefore, the decrease of the machinery exports cannot be accounted for by the fact that we have the home market. In sewing machines there is a decrease in the exports of 1881, of $107,806 worth, while the imports were $193,337 worth, against $101,404 worth in 1878. What could show the Ministers more clearly than these facts that the Tariff is so arranged that it is a positive injury to the manufacturing industries of this country? In woollens the decrease in the exports has been $12,216, while the imports were $8,742,024, in 1881, against $8,535,453 in 1878. I might give other figures to show that the decrease in our exports cannot be accounted for by our having the home market; but what I have quoted will, I think, prove indisputably that the reason our exports of manufactured goods are becoming daily and beautifully less is, that our manufacturers are unable, because of the burdens that have been heaped upon them by this Tariff, to produce goods as cheaply as they formerly produced them, or to compete as successfully in foreign markets. I have made these remarks in order to lead up to the point I bring before the hon. Minister of Finance, and that is, that—as was pointed out when this Tariff was introduced—it is a Tariff for which he is not entirely responsible, but with regard to which the manufacturers were consulted and the duties on different articles increased and increased until we have the Tariff that is the admiration of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Tariff trying to suit these various conflicting interests, and not for the public good, it is no wonder that the effect has been so disastrous as I have pointed out. I am not making that statement without having cognizance of the facts. Last year the hon. Minister of Finance asked us to vote some $400 to a gentleman interested in sugar refining, to pay his expenses to Ottawa and back. For what purpose did he come here? To help to frame the Tariff; and the hon. Minister of Finance, who had given him a Tariff to make him wealthy at the expense of the people of this country, was not ashamed to ask the House to vote his expenses, and a compliant majority did vote compliance. Therefore, we ought not to blame the Finance Minister for this Tariff, because he was not altogether responsible. When I pointed out the inevitable result of imposing heavy duties on raw materials, that it would destroy the export trade, we were told: "No, we have a remedy in the system of drawbacks which we shall put into force;" that is, that they would, by a system of drawbacks, return to manufacturers the amount of duty that had been paid on the raw materials entering into manufactured goods that had been exported to foreign countries. When I moved for that return last year it came down, and what did I find? I found that twenty-one months had elapsed from the inauguration of the National Policy, so-called, to the period of my return, and that the total amount of drawback paid was $15,397.10; but there were 213 claims, amounting to $12,998.84, that were for lobster cans, which did not appear in the manufactured goods of the country, and therefore must come out of the total of $15,379. Deducting that, I found that the total amount paid by way of drawback to manufacturers, on exported goods, was simply $2,380.26 during that period of twenty-one months. Even of that sum $634 was allowed as drawback on corn, used in making starch; $275 on oats, used in making meal; $550 on oil cake, made from linseed; $49 in wire, used in making fences; $34 on tin, used in canning meats, and $836 on flour, manufactured into pilot bread. So the House will see there was not, during those twenty-one months, a single cent of drawback paid to any of the great leading manufacturing industries of this country. Whether the remarks I made last Session have led the Minister of Customs to be a little more liberal in this respect I cannot say; no doubt the hon. gentleman will inform the House with his usual candor. If my remarks had that effect, I am glad; but the hon. gentleman has not gone far enough, as is evidenced by the fact of the continued decrease in our exports of manufactured goods. Why, even admit that you give a drawback on the raw material entering into manufactured goods to the amount of the duty paid, that does not place the Canadian manufacturer in a position to compete with his rivals. Why, take the manufacturer of steam boilers and engines. He uses a large quantity of brass in his manufactures; there is a duty of 30 per cent. to protect the brass manufacturer in Canada. That manufacturer does exactly what every other manufacturer does: he takes advantage of the Tariff, and places 30 per cent. or 29 per cent. on his goods, just sufficient to keep out foreign goods.