

lumbermen of New Brunswick last year exported a large amount of lumber.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Our farmers provide the lumbermen with nearly everything they require in the way of supplies.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—By the exports of the farm and the forest, and I dare say of the fisheries also, it will be seen that those three lines of industry have developed, and to that extent the country has certainly prospered, but not because of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg contends that cotton is cheaper in Canada now than it was when this country was a slaughter market for the manufacturers of the United States. We all know that; but cotton goods would be cheaper anyway. They are cheaper all over the world; the raw material is cheaper; the production of the raw and manufactured material is cheaper; transportation is cheaper, and if it were not for the duty imposed by the National Policy, we could get twice as much cotton, twice as much sugar, and twice as much of many other articles to-day for our money as we do. Yet my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen who hold the same views are accustoming the people of this country, through their speeches and through the press, to consider that it is all through the National Policy that goods are cheaper to-day than they were five years ago. The hon. gentleman, departing from the subject before the House, referred to Mr. Gladstone as an able man and leader of a great party in England; he referred to his policy as being "a shilly-shally policy;" and but for the vacillating policy of Gladstone, Gen. Gordon might have been alive to-day. What has that to do with the National Policy? That was a contingency that might have arisen in any country, and it was a very hard accusation to make against Mr. Gladstone, and had no connection with this debate whatever. If the hon. gentleman wishes to indulge in that kind of reference, I think there are events occurring in our own country; the blood of Canada's sons is crimsoning the snows of the western prairies, they also are entitled to the commiseration of the hon. gentleman; and if he wishes to indulge this fancy, and allow his ima-

gination to roam so as to attach responsibility for such contingencies upon anybody, he can indulge it at home without referring particularly to Mr. Gladstone, who is at the present day the most distinguished man in Great Britain, if not in the world. Referring to the cotton industry, the hon. gentleman contended that the duties on cottons were not a burden on the people. A correspondent of the *Manchester Examiner and Times*, seems to understand the cotton business of Canada pretty well, and replying to another correspondent who had written over the signature of "Verax," says:

"No one knows better than 'Verax' that protection also robs the Treasury, but few perhaps of the general public know to how great an extent this is the case. Of certain classes of cotton goods the Canadians import none; and the reason is not far to seek. A cotton spinner made this calculation, namely, that their protection would pay all the wages of the mill hands. Here, then, the Treasury is completely robbed, and the people of Canada would be as rich if they paid these men and women (the mill hands) their full wages for doing nothing. And this is not all the case against these high duties. The mill-owners have made no money, but have lost heavily, and if one could only now ship the mills and machinery to Lancashire, they could be had cheap, even for Lancashire prices. No doubt there are other classes of goods no longer imported into Canada. The high protective duties in great part, pay for the wages of the workpeople. This is the way our friends in Canada burden themselves with a poor-rate for mill hands, tax the consumer, and rob their Treasury."

In answer to another observation of my hon. friend, in which he spoke of the increased imports from England, and the decreased imports from the United States, the following figures taken from the trade and navigation tables of the Dominion show how our trade is shaping—they give the value of goods from Great Britain and the United States entered for consumption during the last five fiscal years, and the amount of duties paid on them:

	GREAT BRITAIN.		UNITED STATES.	
	Imports.	Duties.	Imports.	Duties.
1880—	\$24,451,224	6,737,007	\$29,846,048	4,521,311
1881—	43,583,808	8,772,050	35,704,112	5,667,253
1882—	50,593,841	10,011,811	45,239,052	7,062,722
1883—	52,062,466	9,897,785	55,062,333	8,168,623
1884—	43,418,015	8,001,371	50,492,826	7,420,462
Total	\$224,112,858	43,421,914	\$220,865,271	33,839,811

Now, I am reluctant to state this as authentic, because it is exactly the reverse of the figures given by my hon. friend in