

same, though in 1883 the price did run up during the time of scarcity. It is only during a time of scarcity that the tariff can possibly help the price of wheat. We had a time of scarcity in 1883, and the price did run up, but that is not to be depended upon. It is very seldom that we have times of scarcity. The crops in this country do not fail very often, and we ought to be thankful for that. There is a clause in the National Policy Act by which the Government can remove the tariff on wheat without any legislation, so that there is no guarantee for the farmers. I heard my friend from North Bruce ask the member for Norfolk a question as to the price of oats in Toronto. The average price under the Mackenzie Administration was a shade higher than it is now. Peas were 75 cents a bushel under the Mackenzie Administration and 73 cents under the National Policy. The barley cry got more votes for the National Policy perhaps than any other. Well, the price of barley averaged 80½ cents under the Mackenzie Administration and 70 cents under the National Policy. Wool is about half the price it was under the Mackenzie Administration.

Mr. IVES. You are trying to pull the wool over our eyes.

Mr. COCKBURN. No, I will simply give the facts. We are told now that we argued in 1878 that the effect of the policy would be to make goods dear. We did argue that, but we argued more. The effect of the policy was to run goods up a little at first, though of course they came down very much afterwards, but in the future we may yet find that the policy may be the means of raising the price of goods, if they are able to bring about any combination. But we stated that there were different phases or stages through which such a policy passed. We also stated that goods would be made ridiculously cheap at other times, so that some factories would have to close up and not employ their men. We must all admit that the effect of the tariff was to stimulate manufacturing—there is no doubt whatever about that. It had the effect of over-stimulating it, and caused a large amount of capital to be locked up and considerable capital to be lost. I can speak on behalf of myself and on behalf of my colleagues here, that the Liberal party are not opposed to manufacturing, that we recognise its utility, and that it is a great factor in making up the sum of the prosperity of the country. But the manufacturers are safer under a revenue tariff than under a high protective tariff, as times change. Oats do not grow tough or sturdy when raised in hot-houses. One great claim for the proposed tariff at that time was that it would retain our people in our own country. That has not been the case, I am sorry to say. The figures quoted against the previous Administration were taken from the American Trade and Commerce Returns. I take the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, and I find the number of people reported by the American Trade and Commerce Returns as leaving in 1878 was 26,100. In 1884, the last year, we have returns of those who left amounting to 60,580, more than twice as many. Therefore the tariff is a complete failure in that respect. It may be said that these people have gone to a highly protected country. We have nothing to do with that. I do not think that they have improved their prospects by going there. We have a splendid country ourselves. We have plenty of territory, and a country in which the crops can be relied upon more than in almost any other country I know of. We have fewer failures of crops, and epidemics among domestic animals are very rare indeed. Therefore I contend that these people have not bettered their condition by going to another country, but the fact remains that the National Policy was powerless and did not perform what they claimed it would do to keep our own people in our own country. It was also stated that our trade with

Mr. COCKBURN.

Great Britain would be promoted, that the tariff was so framed that it would bear more heavily on American manufacturers than on British manufacturers. Now by the last Trade and Navigation Returns of my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, we find that we imported from Great Britain \$43,000,000 worth of goods on which we collected a duty of \$8,000,000; while we imported from the United States \$50,000,000 and only collected \$7,000,000 of revenue. This showing does not take into account the smuggling that is carried on from the United States by these National Policy men, who are protectionists in the day time and free traders after sundown. In saying this I mean to cast no reflection upon the Customs Department, because I believe the hon. Minister of Customs is a very faithful public servant, and his Department is very well administered so far as I know, but it is impossible for him to keep watch over a frontier of 3,000 miles.

Mr. IVES. How is it in Muskoka?

Mr. COCKBURN. I daresay the hon. gentleman knows more about the smuggling business than the people of Muskoka. It is claimed that taxation has not increased, but I find by the Customs returns that the amount collected from Customs duties is 71 cents per head more under the present Administration than it was under the former Administration. That does not seem to be a very large amount, but it is considerable for a whole family. I am not able to gauge exactly how the people are taxed in other ways, but I know they pay higher prices for many of the articles they consume. We know that rubber goods and stoves, for instance, have increased in price. Stove manufacturers are more fortunate than cotton manufacturers, for they have been able to keep up their prices. The Gurney wood cooking stove has increased in price \$3 or \$4. The old-fashioned stoves have gone out of use and can be bought cheaply, but the modern saleable stove is about \$4 higher than it was before the National Policy was introduced. The only respect in which the Gurney wood cooking stove is claimed to be worth more now than it was then, is in the addition of a little nickel ornament worth about 30 or 40 cents. Rubber goods have also increased in price and have deteriorated a good deal in quality. Now, our hon. friends on the Government side laughed at us when we spoke about the necessity of having a cheap country to live in. We find that they are adopting these tactics themselves of dodging the principal issue by calling our attention to present prices. Some hon. members have quoted the prices of certain staple articles to prove that the National Policy has lowered prices. The tariff has nothing whatever to do with respect to the prices of sugar and cotton. Although those articles are extremely cheap in this country, they can be laid down after paying duty just as cheap from other countries. Goods that are higher are higher in consequence of the tariff, and goods that are lower are not lower in consequence of the tariff. It is said to be a poor rule that will not work both ways, but in this case the rule works against the public every time. We are told by the right hon. gentleman that times are better in Canada than they are in the United States or England. That may be, but if that is the case now it was also the case in 1878, and why was not the right hon. gentleman honest enough to have stated so then. Now, we find the hon. gentleman for Cardwell (Mr. White), and some of the leading Conservative papers, gloating over the depression that exists in England. I do not myself think the depression so bad there as they represent it to be, but it would not be any great wonder if it were when we consider the dense population of England, and the circumstances under which they live. It is said that there are large monsters of the deep, iron steamships, lying idle at the docks. But that is in consequence of the dull times in other countries. Those