

many articles of the raw material are heavily taxed. Some of them, indeed, did clamor for Protection. They thought that the few carriages that were coming into the country should be excluded and that they would get higher prices, but instead of that they are getting lower prices, the cost of the raw material is increased, the production is smaller in our part of the country at least, and the carriage makers complain bitterly of the National Policy. I can assure hon. gentlemen that if they expect the support of many carriage makers at the next election, they will find themselves as woefully mistaken as I hope they will be in other predictions they make. Then the hon. gentleman referred to hats and caps, and to felt hats, and he read a letter from Mr. Green, of Montreal, to show that felt hats are sold more cheaply than they could be imported. It seems to me that that gentleman learned his lesson from the Minister of Finance or from the Minister of Railways. Perhaps he did not know that he was learning a lesson, for some people take in knowledge and imbibe ideas without knowing exactly how they get them, and then imagine they are their own. But his ideas are the ideas of hon. gentlemen opposite, who argue, not that any article is sold as cheaply in Canada to-day as it could be imported under the old Tariff, but that it is cheaper to-day than it was seven or eight years ago. When the hon. gentleman came to cottons he admitted that some particular cottons are a little dearer, but you must remember, he says, that the cost of the raw material has increased while the price of the manufactured article is no more in any case than the increase of the price of the raw material, and in some cases it is less. He very conveniently forgot to say anything about the raw material when he came to talk of woollens. When he tells us that the woollen cloth is cheaper than it was ever before in Canada, and puts that forward as a proof that the National Policy does not increase the cost of such articles, he does not tell us that the price of wool has fallen some 20 cents a pound or thereabouts, or that the price of those goods has fallen so low in other countries that the manufacturers, though so highly protected, cannot charge any more than they are doing. I would like to know how many cases there are in which the manufacturers charge less than the cost of importation plus the duty. I believe that where the articles are at all of equal quality there are scarcely any such cases. The only case which the hon. Minister of Finance put in such a light is the case of the knitting yarn of Mr. Parks, of the city of St. John. We had that case talked about all through the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman told us that horse shoe nails were at first sold very cheaply, because the persons manufacturing them wished to introduce them, and as soon as the market was created they could raise their price. He did not tell the House that the manufacture of this knitting yarn is a very new manufacture in New Brunswick, introduced only within a year or two, and that it is quite possible Mr. Park is trying to follow the example of those horse shoe nails manufacturers, introducing it into the country, and that then, if the National Policy continues to exist, he will advance his price. There is, however, a question as to the possibility of importing these articles, which was very fully discussed in the Lower Provinces; but no rational man, no impartial, intelligent man, who will examine all the evidence on this subject, can have the slightest doubt that the price of warps has advanced in this country to just the point at which the imported article, plus the duty would be sold. That was the only argument by which the hon. gentleman attempted to show that the manufactured article was sold any cheaper than the imported article could be sold. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the evidences we have of the prosperity of this country. We would like to hear where the ninety new factories are. It would be gratifying for us to know that these new factories have gone up, and that there is a prospect of their securing sufficient support under a revenue

Mr. ANGLIN.

Tariff—because I think it will hardly be contended by any gentleman on the opposite side of the House that for all time to come these industries should be treated as infant industries, and treated as though a Tariff of 17 or 20 per cent., or whatever the necessities of this country may require, would not be sufficient protection for them. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think it a very fine thing that a large number of our people should be converted into servants of that great class which they are building up, who, they boast, spend their money in silks and satins, fine paintings, and all kinds of luxuries—wealth not created by their own skill or industry, but extracted from the hard earnings of the masses of the people. Just see, the hon. gentleman says, what these wealthy men have spent during the past year; and he actually attempted to lead to the inference that because a larger amount is paid in duty to-day than was paid two or three years ago on the finer cloths and silks, therefore the rate of taxation on these articles is more than it was before. He scarcely had the hardihood to put the conclusion in so many words. Now, Sir, where is all the benefit of the National Policy? Who are so wonderfully prosperous in this country? Hon. gentlemen opposite cry continually: oh, the great prosperity of the country—the great contentment of the people of this country—the wonderful progress of the country—the happiness and the surprising growth in wealth of the people of this country. Sir, we are, I suppose, as a whole, better off than we were some years ago; although, unfortunately for the city I come from, we have not felt very much prosperity there. We did a little more business last year than we did the year before, but we were foolish enough to attribute that to the fact that there was in England and in the United States an increased demand for lumber, which gave our ships and our men more employment. We cannot see how the National Policy has anything to do with it, or how it has increased the business of the city. Many a house in the town has the placard “to let” on its windows. The prosperity is not to be found there. It is scarcely to be found in the city of Quebec. I assert as the result of my own observations, that though there may be more employment and greater prosperity in Montreal, and probably a better state of things than in 1879—about which hon. gentlemen opposite talk—yet the condition of affairs to-day is not so good as it was six or seven years ago. There are not so many men employed in that city, nor are there so many living there, the wages are not so good and property is not of equal value. But the hon. gentleman says: “Look at the bank stocks.” Why, the bank stocks, he says, have at present such market prices that to-day they are worth \$20,000,000 more than they were worth—when? When Mr. Mackenzie and his associates left office? Not at all. At any time when the hon. member for South Huron administered the affairs of the country? Not at all. But the \$20,000,000 was the increase over 1879. Hon. gentlemen opposite promised that the National Policy would increase the value of stocks; but when they got into power, stocks within a few days declined in value \$6,000,000. It is with the prices at that point reached after hon. gentlemen opposite assumed office that the Minister of Finance compares the price of to-day, and he claims as a result of the National Policy, an improvement in the prices of stocks. That improvement is caused by the fact that there is to-day, throughout the civilized world, for some reason or other, a superabundance of capital seeking employment. If you look at the stock markets in another way you will form the conclusion that instead of stocks being in a better position now than four, five or six years ago, they are in a very much worse position. Take the favorite stocks in Canada, and you will find that in no instance is the investor receiving more than 5 or 5½ per cent. for his money. The Finance Minister does not care, perhaps, to look at that aspect of the case, but it is an important aspect. Bank stocks are a risky investment. There