

gentlemen who have spoken upon this question from the opposite side of the Chamber. My hon. friend from South Brant, in the course of his excellent speech, pointed out to the House, in a very forcible manner, the fact that, under the operation of the present Tariff, the export trade of the Dominion in manufactures is steadily decreasing. That, Sir, is a circumstance attending the operation of all protective Tariffs. The effect of high protective duties, when they are levied upon raw materials, is necessarily to diminish the ability of manufacturers to compete in neutral markets with the manufacturers in any country who are not subjected to the payment of duties upon their raw material. For that reason we find that in all protected countries the export trade in manufactures is insignificant. We might point out a good many instances to illustrate this view of the case. I shall confine myself on this occasion to one or two only, and I might cite, and will cite, the instance of the United States. The United States, after having been under the operation of a high protective system for twenty-one years have succeeded in developing, to a limited degree only, exports and manufactures, and I find that for the year 1880 the report of manufactures from the United States, including petroleum, a very large item, and an article in which, from the circumstances, they have a monopoly, and including also manufactured lumber, reached only the sum of \$104,000,000 in round numbers. That country, in 1860, after a long period of a revenue Tariff, reached, in the exports of manufactured cottons, \$10,930,000. In the year 1880, after twenty years of protection, the export of cotton manufactures from the United States, was \$9,880,000, considerably more than \$1,000,000 less than it had been twenty years previous; and at no time during the twenty years of the operation of protection in the United States, have the exports of cotton manufactures equalled those in 1860, at the close of the revenue Tariff period. I find that that country in 1880, after twenty years of protection, exported \$346,000 of woollen goods. Their exports of woollen goods amounted to two-thirds of 1 cent per head of the population, and their exports of cotton goods to less than 20 cents per head. Their total exports of all manufactures, including petroleum and lumber, amounted to a trifle over \$2 per head. Now, Sir, the country, whilst under the operation of this Tariff, taxed itself to an enormous extent. The best Economists in the United States tell us that the domestic productions of the country are enhanced in value to two-thirds the amount of the duty upon the imported article. The average range of duties in the United States is about 36 per cent. If this assumption is true, then the domestic productions of the United States, amounting to some 3,000,000,000 of dollars, are made \$720,000,000 dearer to the purchasers of that country than they would be under a different system. This, then, amounts to a tax upon every man, woman and child in the United States, in the enhanced cost of domestic goods, of \$18 per head; in other words, in order to secure a position by which they are enabled to export \$2 worth per head of manufactures, they pay taxes of \$18 per head upon the domestic productions of the country in addition to the tax they pay the Customs revenue. Well, Sir, the industries of that country that have been promoted and fostered for twenty years, are still reluctant to dispense with that protection which they claimed as infant industries twenty years ago, they are still infant industries, and they will ever remain infant industries under the operation of a protective system such as prevails in that country. Certain circumstances lead careful observers to the belief that one thing only prevents the United States from taking its position as the great manufacturing country of the world, and that thing is, its absurd fiscal policy. To-day, one of the great American manufacturing concerns, the Singer Sewing Machine Company, are erecting works, covering forty acres of ground, that are to employ

4,000 operatives and are to produce 3,000,000 sewing machines a year near Glasgow, they have transferred this business to Scotland, because, under the American tariff laws, they cannot prosecute it in the United States and supply the export demand. But for protection they could carry on the business in the United States, and make their three millions of machines annually, and at the same time supply the home market, as at present. This one fact illustrates the position I take—the position that is taken by Economists everywhere—that the Tariff system of the United States alone stands in the way of that great country assuming a position as the foremost manufacturing nation of the world, in place of the position it now holds of exporting, the beggarly amount of \$2 per head of manufactures. While the export of manufactures has fallen off in Canada, as it has fallen off in the United States as compared with a revenue Tariff for the period ending in 1880, the Trade and Navigation Returns indicate that our manufacturers have not secured the control even of our own market. It seems that in the year 1881 we imported something over \$10,000,000 worth of cotton goods. It seems that in that same year we imported \$3,750,000 worth of woollen goods. It seems that in that same year we imported \$12,800,000 worth of iron and steel, and their manufactures. It seems that in almost all lines imports are increasing, notwithstanding the adoption of a policy that was to exclude these products from our markets, and give to our manufacturers the control of the Canadian market. Now, Sir, in view of the fact that the imports of goods are increasing in Canada, in view of the fact that the exports of manufactures are diminishing in Canada, I would like to ask, at this stage of my remarks, what was the character of our last Tariff? Was that Tariff, which was supplanted by the present one, a Tariff that operated to the injury of the manufacturing interests of this country? Was it a Tariff under which our manufacturing industries could not be developed? I hold that, on the contrary, it was a Tariff under which the manufacturing industries of Canada had been developed, were developing, and would have gone on developing. I believe that, with the revival of times, with the increase of prosperity, that came from causes entirely beyond our control; that had that Tariff remained in operation up to the present time, our exhibit as a manufacturing people would have been more favorable indeed than it is under the Tariff now in operation. I laid before this House, in 1876, a statement, showing that, notwithstanding the depression that existed in Canada at that time, our manufacturers were in a better position, in a stronger position, were making larger sums on their investments, than were the manufacturers of New England or any other portion of the United States. That statement proved conclusively that, notwithstanding the depression, our manufacturers were in a fairly good position, in a comparatively better position, than the manufacturers of almost any other country. The depression was due, not to the Tariff, but to causes quite outside the Tariff. The depression would have passed away as readily, I believe more readily, without a change of Tariff than with the change of Tariff made by the present Administration. Then, Sir, with reference to the amount of our manufactures, the Census of 1871 shows that we produced in that year \$211,000,000 worth of manufactured goods in this country. This is an increase which grew up under a moderate revenue Tariff. I believe that when the Tariff changed, our production of goods was not less than \$250,000,000 per annum, and perhaps amounted to \$275,000,000. I find, on looking over the field and examining into the various branches of manufactures, that most of our successful manufacturers began with little capital. In the case of one firm—and I take the liberty of mentioning their name, because they appeared before the Depression Committee in 1876—in the case of the Messrs. Gurney it was acknowledged in 1876