

Of that \$1,100,000 are derived from those two most odious and oppressive taxes, which were never imposed in any civilized country before—under similar circumstances at least—the taxes on breadstuffs and on fuel. And if we added the expenditure on Dominion Lands, we would find that—deducting these two taxes which ought never to be imposed, and which could only be defended by the most extreme fiscal necessities, and adding a sum which for the purposes of comparison at least should be added—the hon. gentleman's surplus of \$4,000,000 would shrink to \$2,500,000. I can understand, and I am quite prepared to admit, that there are circumstances under which a surplus is just cause for congratulation. We have known in the past some such circumstances. I remember very well, under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, when, without adding one penny to the burdens of the people of this country, from its natural growth and increase, a surplus relatively quite as large as this of which the hon. gentleman boasts, was obtained by Sir Francis Hincks. I admit that that was a fair and just ground for congratulation. Had this surplus been so obtained I would admit that it was a fair and just ground for congratulation; but what does the reality show? The reality shows the most oppressive system of taxation. The facts are these: The statements made by myself and my hon. friend, which the hon. gentleman has no doubt inadvertently misquoted, have been verified to the letter. Those statements were these: I told the hon. Minister that if he aimed to obtain revenue, he would find his Tariff was a total failure so long as the exports of the country continued low, and so long as there was no general improvement; but that the moment our exports increased, the moment that the general improvement, which I foresaw would shortly arrive, came, that moment the Tariff which he chose to abrogate would, without any further burdening the people, have produced fully as large a surplus as the hon. gentleman has boasted of to-day—at all events fully as large a surplus if you deduct those obnoxious duties on coal and breadstuffs. What did my hon. friend beside me state? The hon. member pointed out what has since proved to be correct, that whereas the hon. gentleman stated that all he needed was \$2,000,000, he had so grossly overloaded the taxation, and had gone so far beyond what was actually required, that this Tariff would produce \$7,000,000 instead of \$2,000,000 the moment our trade improved. The facts were that the \$7,000,000 which my hon. friend stated would be produced, and more, were taken out of the pockets of the people when only \$2,000,000 were required. Now, I will tell the hon. gentleman what were the conditions, in my judgment, at all events, under which the National Policy might fairly claim to be credited with this surplus and improvement. Let those hon. gentlemen show, if they can, that those increased exports, on which the whole increased imports depend, are due to the National Policy. Let them show that the increased imports are due to the National Policy, and then I, for my part, will freely and fully admit that the National Policy has had something to do with the increase of this surplus. But, Mr. Speaker, if we find that facts utterly and entirely contradict that absurd assertion, that the exports have increased from causes over which those hon. gentlemen could exercise no more control than over the procession of the equinoxes; if we find they are due absolutely and wholly to the increase in the lumber trade, exports of animals and their products, and of agricultural produce,—then I say those hon. gentlemen stand condemned as imposters who have laid claim to an improvement which their policy was not able to prevent, but which it certainly did nothing to create or stimulate. What are the broad facts of the case? They are these: that in 1879 we exported, exclusive of bullion and estimated short returns, \$60,000,000 worth of products; that in 1880 we exported \$70,000,000, and in 1881, very nearly

\$81,000,000. Now, Sir, how was that made up? Why, in two years, from 1879 to 1881, our exports of the forests rose from \$13,250,000 to \$25,000,000—\$12,000,000 of that \$20,000,000 were due to the increased exports of lumber—and in the case of animals and their products, the exports rose from \$14,000,000 to \$21,333,000. There, Sir, you have the whole increase. Does the hon. member expect we would believe, will he even venture to assert here that his policy has contributed to the increase of the exports of lumber or of animals and their products from the Dominion? If he does, I wish that he or some of his friends would condescend to show us how. I shall show him and this House, and I think the country, that what his policy has done in that direction has been to retard and injure the growth of those two great industries, that the hon. gentleman is not entitled to an iota of credit for the increase of exports which have taken place, and out of which the imports have been paid. How does the hon. gentleman propose to deal with these facts—facts contained in the Trade and Navigation Returns, and as well known to him as to hon. members on this side of the House. But probably, Sir, the hon. gentleman, as he has dealt with other difficulties, will not deal with them at all. The hon. gentleman is, however, blessed with colleagues a little more logical than himself, and I will give to the House an extract from a speech made by one of his colleagues, in which an explanation is offered tending to show that the National Policy, the policy of taxing everything that the producers of these articles use, did contribute to increase our exports of lumber and our exports of agricultural and animal products. On a certain occasion the hon. Minister of Public Works was banquetted in the good city of Hamilton, and after dinner the hon. gentleman was good enough to explain how it was that the National Policy had contributed to the increase of these exports. "The fact is," said he, "that as soon as that great policy was proclaimed, so great was the immediate revival of confidence in the people, that they at once set to work to plough more land, to grow more crops, and to raise more cattle." Well, the hon. gentleman, in order to establish his friends' case, found it necessary to assert this. But if the hon. gentlemen had been with me, a few weeks later, when I read that wonderful exposition of the effects of the National Policy to a couple of thousand of the best agriculturists in Western Canada, and heard the shouts of uncontrollable laughter which greeted it, he would have understood that, although logical, it was not likely to be effective, at any rate, with the hard-headed farmers of Western Canada. When I asked those 2,000 farmers, numbering among them as good agriculturists as can be found in the Dominion, and among whom were a great many supporters of the hon. Minister of the Interior, whether there was one among them who had been induced by the immediate revival of confidence to set to work and plough more land, grow more crops and raise more cattle, not one could be found to stand up and say he had grown a bushel more of grain or a pound more of beef. The actual fact is in direct contradiction to this ingenious theory. Immediately on the introduction of that policy, as every one acquainted with Western Canada knows, there was a large and lamentable exodus of many of the best farmers of the western region, not, I am sorry to say, to our own North-West, but to Dakota, Minnesota and other portions of the United States.

Mr. PLUMB. And to Texas and Kansas.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. If the policy had any effect at all it was not to increase the number of acres under plough or the amount of crops and cattle raised, but sensibly and materially to diminish them. I said, and I repeat, that the hon. gentleman's Tariff, as a revenue Tariff, was an utter failure, as low as our exports continued small. Take the Revenue Returns for 1879 and those for 1880, and you will