

pered. Now our infant industries have been fostered and have grown to be an important factor in our national life. The manufacture of cotton goods has been a little overdone, but that is the only exception. England does not like it; they tell us there that we are very poor political economists. We admit it, but we say in answer that it suits us. We are only four and a half millions of people, but we are prosperous."

Well, Sir, the hon. Postmaster General also made some remarks. I read from the *London Advertiser* of 13th December, 1881. It says:

"Mr. Carling informed his audience at the city hall, on Tuesday night, that he knew no period in the history of this country when it was more prosperous than at the present moment. Many of his Tory listeners were astonished. This declaration from the Postmaster-General fairly took their breath. One man informed us that he had had two days' work in seven weeks. Several of Mr. Carling's listeners have been for days looking for employment, but without success."

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) also says this country is prosperous, and to prove that statement he tells us there are 60,000 families in London, England, who live in one room each; that there are 40 per cent. of the children in certain school districts in London that go to school in the forenoon without their breakfast; that there are 28 per cent. of the children in certain districts that go to school in the afternoon without their dinners, and that there are 10 per cent. of the children in certain school districts that have no fathers at all. Now, Sir, I do not see what this has to do with the prosperity of this country, and I think if the hon. gentleman cannot make better comparisons than that to prove that the country is prosperous, he had better keep his seat in future, and allow others to discuss the question. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) says there is a temporary depression, but he takes comfort. He says there are symptoms of improvement and prosperity, and he quotes as authority King and Ward lumberman of Montreal to prove that prosperity. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I am a lumberman; I have been in that business since 1861; and at no time, during the last twelve years at least, the lumbermen have not paid as low wages to the workmen as they have during the last fall and winter. I do not think we need go outside of the city of Ottawa to prove that fact. I noticed in the papers last fall that the lumbermen of Ottawa were hiring their men at from \$10 to \$12 a month, and there were hundreds of applicants even at those figures who could get no employment. That shows, I think, that the statements made by Mr. Ward, of Montreal, will not apply to this part of the country. Now, Sir, let us see what is the case in other parts of the country; let us see what is the condition of affairs down by the sea. We have heard from a number of gentlemen on both sides of the House, some telling us that there is prosperity in the Maritime Provinces, and some telling us that there is not. I have here a paper, said to have been written by a Liberal Conservative to the Moncton, N.B., *Transcript*, in September last, in which he says:

"We admit our taxes are doubled, acknowledge some public works, such as the portions of the Intercolonial Railway to connect the line we had before with Quebec and Canada, a grain elevator at Halifax that has nothing to do, some branch lines of railway which reflect but little credit on the promoters, and of questionable value at the best, our trade gone, inundated with goods from Canada sent to us at a slaughter market, mercantile depression at Halifax and St. John existing, which it may almost be said has existed for many years, going from bad to worse, no immigration coming in, no sensible increase in the population, our young men of all classes leaving the country, not from choice but necessity; no markets for our farmers, and to sum up, the Maritime Provinces paralysed for want of a fostering care which should be directed to build up our trade and commerce, and place the country in a sound financial position. It has become a one man power—a Tupper for Nova Scotia resident at Ottawa or London; a Tilley for New Brunswick."

Now, Sir, this comes from the Maritime Provinces; this comes from down by the sea.

Mr. IVES. It smells salt.

Mr. JACKSON. Now, I have another statement which should be authoritative on the subject. His Excellency

the Governor General is reported to have said in reply to an address presented to him in St. John, N.B.:

"I wish it had been my good fortune to have come here at a moment when, standing in the midst of a commercial community, I might have offered you my congratulations upon the state of trade in the Province of New Brunswick. It is, however, useless to conceal from ourselves the fact that business has lately been in a far from satisfactory state, and that notably in the case of the timber trade, which occupies so important a place in your commercial system, there has been a very serious contraction of business. These are facts which we have to look in the face, and no optimism is more senseless than that which shuts its eyes to them."

Now, here we have a plain contradiction between the First Minister and His Excellency the Governor General. One states in New York that the country is prosperous; the other states in St. John, New Brunswick, that there is a great depression. This is certainly a curious coincidence. There must be something wrong; as the proverb says, a kingdom fighting against itself cannot stand; therefore, according to that proverb, there must be a downfall pretty soon. Now, Sir, I claim that no man ever took charge of the affairs of any nation under such favorable circumstances as did the Conservative party in 1878. The star of prosperity was then to be seen in the horizon. A change for the better had already taken place in the United States. Factories which had been lying idle since 1873, were re-opened; iron factories which had been lying idle for three years at least, were beginning to open up again; furnaces were being relighted; the lumber trade which had been comparatively dead since 1873, felt the stimulus; prices were advancing; and the country in general was becoming prosperous. The years 1879, 1880, 1881 and 1882, were four of the most prosperous years that the United States ever experienced. These are facts which I know myself, for I was doing business in that country during that whole term of years. Well, Sir, Canada lying contiguous to the United States, and depending on the United States markets for the disposal of a large amount of its exports, necessarily felt the benefit of that revival in the United States; and that circumstance, together with the good crops and high prices that prevailed in this country—not brought about by the National Policy, but the result of bad harvests in Europe, England being the place where the market for wheat was established—produced in Canada during three or four years, from 1879 to 1882, a greater prosperity than almost the most sanguine could have expected. Now, I claim that this Government had it in their power to build up the industries of this country as no other Government ever had. Had they, when giving the contract to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, inserted a clause in that contract, compelling the company to purchase in this country their entire rolling stock, and a portion of their steel rails, which might have been manufactured here had the duty been taken off coal, instead of the country suffering depression as it is to-day, it would have been one of the most prosperous countries in the world. But what are the facts? Nearly the whole of the rolling stock for the Canadian Pacific Railway has been bought in the United States, and the steel rails have been bought in England or the United States; and I have been told, although I am not positive, that a portion of that material has been brought in free of duty. I intend to ask the question whether that is true or not.

Mr. BOWELL. What articles?

Mr. JACKSON. Rolling stock.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you. Well, Sir, what effect has the purchasing of that material in the United States had on this country. The industries of this country might have been built up enormously by its manufacture here.