

that they were worth \$750,000. They commenced business, twenty years before, without a dollar and yet they managed to accumulate from their business an average of \$37,000 a year besides their living. The Tariff, which allows such an accumulation of wealth in twenty years, the establishment of a great business founded on nothing but the intelligence and energy of the men who founded it, was certainly one which might fairly be claimed as calculated to foster the industries of the country. I find, in looking over the country, and by correspondence with manufacturers, that the great majority of manufacturers in Ontario were men who commenced on very small means; that the great majority were highly successful, and that the majority of them were highly satisfied with the fiscal policy which prevailed before the change of the Tariff three years ago. I find that a great many of these manufacturers to-day are dissatisfied with the present Tariff, and pronounce it worse than the one which preceded it.

Hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. I will show, in the course of my remarks, that this is true, and that if the duty had been raised in 1876—as I am free to say it should have been—to 20 per cent., it would have been amply satisfactory to the manufacturers of this country, and, with free raw material, would have placed them in, and left them in, a better position than they have since occupied. I believe that if the duty had been raised 2½ per cent. my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper), was all ready and prepared to condemn that increased duty. I think it is a matter of public notoriety that the hon. gentleman made a very sudden and skilful change of base when the Finance Minister of that day disappointed the hon. gentleman's expectations by announcing that the duties would not be raised 2½ per cent. It is claimed that the Reform party are hostile to the manufacturers. Great pains are taken to impress the manufacturers with the belief that the policy of the party represented on this of the Chamber is one hostile to the manufacturing interests of the country. Sir, that is an allegation that I emphatically deny. The Reform party is not hostile to the manufacturing interests of the country; it is not hostile to any great interest of this country. It simply demands that there shall be equitable taxation, that due regard shall be paid to the interest of all classes; that no one interest shall be unjustly promoted to the detriment of other interests. The Reform party is willing to adopt a policy which has been conducive to the prosperity of the manufacturers in the past; which will be conducive to their prosperity in the future; which will be more conducive to their permanent and substantial prosperity than the one which is now in operation. I may say that I think we shall be able to quiet the troubled mind of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bowell), as to what our policy is. In the course of his remarks on this question he was very anxious that we should know what we meant—to define our position. We shall be able to define our position. We shall unquestionably define our position during the course of this Session, so that he will comprehend it. He will find it not hostile to any great interest in this country. He will find it calculated to promote all the great industries of this country, the manufacturers among the rest. And, Sir, we declaim most emphatically the allegation which has been made that we are the enemies of that or any other interests in this country. I hold that with a Tariff imposing duties for revenue purposes of 20 per cent., a Tariff permitting the admission of the raw material free of duty, would make the position of every manufacturer of this country, with possibly the exception of the manufacturers of sugar and cotton, better than it is to-day. I hold, Sir, that such a Tariff, while pressing less heavily upon the masses of the people, or extracting less money

Mr. CHARLTON.

from their pockets, while yielding all the revenue necessary, would be infinitely better for the manufacturing interests. And the very fact, Mr. Speaker, that a drawback is allowed in some cases upon the exported manufactured article is itself a proof that the present Tariff is burdensome to the manufacturer. If it was not so, why the drawback—why the rebate? It is an admission, Sir, that the articles necessary to the manufacturer in the progress of his business—his raw materials—are taxed by the Government; it means that the cost of the article he produces is enhanced to that extent, and when he attempts to export it and meets his competitors in a neutral market, who are not subject to the same duties, it is necessary, in order to place him on a footing of equality, for the Government to repay to him the sum extracted from him in the shape of duty on the raw material. It is true that our manufacturers are prosperous at the present time; it is true that their prosperity is almost as great as it would have been at the present time, under the old Tariff with the revival which has taken place, but I do not believe that the great mass of the manufacturers are as prosperous as they would have been under the Tariff which was supplanted by the present one. I have some letters from leading manufacturers which explain their views as to the operations of the present Tariff. I have one from a large establishment in my own county, engaged in the manufacture of reapers and mowers, in which they explain the enhanced cost of each machine in consequence of the increased duties imposed by the Tariff. It is as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—Yours of yesterday received asking for details of extra duties over those of 1878 in our manufactures. Below we give them to you, and they are under rather than over the mark. In the construction of our reaper, we use 500 lbs. cast iron, 50 cents; 5 lbs. malleables, additional duties, 24 cents; 32 lbs. spring steel, 13 cents; 16 lbs. machinery steel, 10 cents; and say \$1 worth of bolts, 25 cents; 75 lbs. wrought iron, 19 cents; 1 lb. nuts, 1 cent; paints and oils, 4 cents; varnish, 5 cents; coal, 3 cents; wire, 1 cent; knives, 20 cents; total \$1.75."

This last sum represents the extra cost to that Company on one reaper as compared with the cost of material under the preceding Tariff. They say that this is within the mark, so that we may take the amount at \$2 on each machine, or an aggregate cost upon their business of about \$2,000, which they cannot get from their customers, because they have to sell their machines as low as formerly.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). How is it that the manufacturers are selling the machines from 10 to 15 per cent. cheaper than they were under the old Tariff?

Mr. CHARLTON. This manufacturer tells us that he is not making as much on his machines as he did before.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Then the manufacturers are not public robbers,

Mr. CHARLTON. He tells us that they are selling machines at as low a price as they did formerly, while under the Tariff they cost them more, and therefore the Tariff injures them. The question is not whether they are selling machines for more or less, but whether they are making as much under the Tariff as they were before it was adopted. Then we are told that they have control of the Canadian market. They had it before. This letter is from the firm of Green Brothers, of Waterford, Ontario. I have another from Noxon Brothers, of Ingersoll, one of the largest firms in Ontario, which I will take the liberty of reading:

"INGERSOLL, 2nd February, 1882.

"DEAR SIR,—I have your letter of the 27th ult. As nearly as we can estimate, the cost of our goods has been increased from eleven to twelve per cent. by the present Tariff. The cost of labor has not increased; we are not employing the same proportion of skilled mechanics as under the old Tariff; we have taken boys and ordinary laboring men and trained them to do our special kind of work only, and in this way displaced a large number of skilled tradesmen. The men and boys we train in this way never become mechanics in our works, and if put to