

That is the record with respect to the progress made by manufacturers in Canada: first, up to 1871 under a clear and distinct revenue tariff policy, and second from 1871 to 1881 under a revenue tariff for nine-tenths of the period at least, which shows a vastly greater development of manufacturing interests in this country than was acquired in the United States under a high protective tariff from 1870 to 1880. Wherever we may look we cannot fail to be impressed by the fact that a satisfactory and rapid development of the manufacturing interests of this country has been secured under a revenue tariff policy, and that an equally satisfactory and an equally rapid development of the manufacturing interests of the United States has also been secured under a revenue tariff policy. The manufacturing industries of the United States were in a relatively stronger and more healthy condition in 1860 than they were in 1884. The exports of the manufacturers of that country were relatively larger than they are now. The exports of cotton goods in 1860 were larger than they have ever been since except in one or two years; and if the progress made from 1850 to 1860 under the revenue tariff policy had been maintained till 1884, the development of the manufacturing interests of the United States would have been as great as it is to-day. Will the hon. Minister assure me that his policy has benefitted any considerable class in this country? Will he tell me it has benefitted the lumberman? I know it has not. Will he tell me it has benefitted the fisherman of his native Province and of Nova Scotia?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; no man of common sense will say so. Will he tell me it has benefited the laborers of Canada?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will he tell me it has benefitted the cotton operative, who is working on short time and at reduced pay, and whose average earnings are \$45 less a year than in 1878? The laborers

will tell him, no. Will the hon. gentleman tell me it has benefitted the farmer?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will he tell me that the National Policy is not, in some measure, responsible for the present depression in prices?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say yes; and I will demonstrate it. It is true that, as a rule, you cannot raise or lower the price of produce by the operation of a tariff; but a policy may be adopted by a country which, in the end, will produce important results, either in advancing or in depressing the prices of produce.

How the N. P. Depresses Prices of Grain.

England is the great market for Canada and the United States. England buys her food and she produces the fabrics that the world consumes. She exchanges the products of her forges, looms, and mills for the produce of the farmers of the new world. That trade is a trade of mutual exchange, and it can be carried on only as an exchange. England cannot be excluded from the markets of the United States and Canada, and continue to draw from those countries her supplies of food. She must be able to give to those countries the productions of her labor in order to take from those countries the products of their labor. The United States, for twenty years, and Canada for six years, have adopted a fiscal policy of enmity to England, a policy the effect of which is designed to exclude the products of British labor from the markets of these countries. What has England done? Could she continue to buy her supplies of food from this continent and pay us in gold? Could she continue to sail her vessels to our ports in ballast, and charge double freight, because there was a cargo only one way? Has she not looked round to procure food supplies in exchange for the products of her labor? Has she not spent millions in constructing a railway system in India, so that she might reach the wheat fields at the

base
with
food
She
India
drive
policy
States
policy
depre
duce i
to an
Sir, t
the p
the C
of eve
to sell
tion of
at vari
and dr
the pec
surplus
the ope
policy
taxes o
the sha
imposed
an enha
of consu
try, and
in the s
of farm
dred
in Eng
she has
article
for ma
been lo
notwith
hon. ge
agricult
Canada
blessing
curses i
Well
more e
for the
ment t
certain
them to
To
they m
we were