

can look back with pride and satisfaction, and say that under it the country prospered. But we have to look further than that: we have to look to the present prosperity of Canada; to the home industries which have been established; to the home markets which have been created; to the home consumption of all our manufactured products, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to say, if they can, that the country is in a worse state now than it was under the Administration of their own party. Hon. gentlemen talk of the exports of the forest as helping to produce the mercantile prosperity which at present exists. I have figures to show that the exports of the forest, in 1877, amounted to \$23,010,349, and, in 1878, to \$19,511,574, making a total of exports of the forest, in the last two years of the Mackenzie Administration, of \$42,521,824. I presume that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will try to make the country believe that there has been an increase in the exports, and that therefore we have excellent times. In 1879, the exports amounted to \$13,261,459, and, in 1880, to \$16,854,507, a total of \$30,115,966; showing a difference in favor of the exports of the forest, during the Mackenzie Administration, of no less than \$12,405,858, or a total excess of the exports of the forest and farm, in favor of that Administration during the years I have mentioned, of \$28,608,045. Now, I ask hon. members of this House if the three last years of the late Administration were prosperous years, which can be remembered with anything like pleasure, or if those who had to live by the sweat of their brows had full recompense for their labor. The hon. member for Brant tried to lead this House to believe that the manufacturing industries of this country were suffering. What are the facts? I appeal to the hon. gentleman to candidly state whether they are not prospering in his own city beyond anything he ever anticipated. He must admit that there is scarcely an industry there that is not busily employed, almost to double the extent it was in former years, and that new industries have been created. He speaks of cottons having been brought into this country. I could not go to the cotton factory in his own town and give an order in the hope of having it filled in less than three months. And yet the hon. member would make it appear that the industries of this country are in distress. I say it shows a want of fair play to quote figures in the attempt to show that times are bad, that the policy of this Government is a mistake, and that we ought to go back to the policy of their predecessors. When we compare the records, I think hon. gentlemen opposite should hide their heads in shame that they were unable to legislate in the interest of the industries of the country, and that they now try to show that the country is suffering, because it is ruled by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to make only a few remarks in order to correct some words that have been put into my mouth. It is a matter of regret that when I endeavored to make my statement as fair as I could, the hon. member for Niagara should have made that a charge against me. The hon. member, instead of finding fault, should give me credit, because I made it a point to give every item of manufacture, no matter how it told, so that no man could say that I had made a garbled statement; and to make that a charge against me shows a lack of fairness on the part of the hon. gentleman. Another statement put in my mouth is, that the manufacturers of this country are not in a prosperous condition. I made no such statement. I was speaking wholly of our export trade, and I said that, so far as the ability of our manufacturers to do an export trade was concerned, they were handicapped by this Tariff. Hon. gentlemen call on me to testify as to whether the manufacturers of Canada are doing well or not. I believe that perhaps never were the manufacturers of Canada enjoying more prosperity than they are to-day. I believe that at no period have the manufacturers of Brantford done bet-

ter than they are doing to-day. But if that is true of them, it is true of all other classes in the community. If the National Policy was intended to do anything, it was intended to kill off the importer, and yet the testimony of importers is that they were never doing as well as they are doing now. The same may be said of the farmers, the lumbermen, and all other classes of the community. But the great point to consider is this: When we are all doing well, is that fact due to the Tariff? I say that it is not a result of the Tariff, but in spite of it; that so far as the Tariff is concerned, it is an injury and not a benefit; in other words, prosperous as our merchants and manufacturers are, they would be more prosperous if the Tariff was to-day as it was before. The \$30,000,000 of extra gold brought into this country during the last two years is the result of our exports of agricultural products, animals and their produce, and lumber. But did the National Policy cause heaven's rain to fall, or the sun to shine on our fields, giving us higher prices for our goods; or did the National Policy cause the rain to fall on the fields of England, Scotland or Ireland, blighting their harvests, and opening a market for what we had to sell? Did the National Policy raise the price of wheat in Liverpool, or the price of lumber in Albany, or in the markets of Great Britain? Clearly not. Therefore, that \$30,000,000 of extra gold that came into this country came in, in spite of the Tariff, and not as a result of it, and enabled the people of this country to buy more freely the goods they needed than before, and our manufacturers are thus sharing in the general prosperity. When hon. gentlemen opposite point to the manufacturers of my town as doing better than before, they must give them credit for common sense; and the manufacturers of my town resent the theory that they exist by the grace of the Finance Minister of this country. They contend that they are thriving because they are putting money and energy into their business, and not because of this Tariff, which every one of these gentlemen wish to have changed. The manufacturers in Brantford are doing well, the manufacturers in Canada are doing well, all classes in Canada are doing well, and they are doing well in spite of the Tariff, and as a result of the extra gold brought into the country from the causes I have mentioned, over which hon. gentlemen opposite have no control whatever. I trust I have now made myself, at all events, sufficiently plain that hon. gentlemen opposite can comprehend the position I take on this question.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman through the whole of his speech, nor the details of the figures which he has presented to the House; but I desire to call attention to one or two facts in connection with his speech which may possibly explain why the exports of the articles to which he referred have not been so great as in former years. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was very anxious that some member of the Cabinet should refer to the speech of the hon. member for South Brant, on account of the logic, I suppose, he thought contained in the remarks he had offered. If hon. gentlemen opposite would settle among themselves what their policy is, or is to be, it would be very much better not only for the country but for themselves. We have the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), who has declared that every manufacturer who has been protected is a highway robber, or language to that effect. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) has harked back since his speech made in Dundee, when he announced himself such an ardent Free Trader.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I made no change whatever.

Mr. BOWELL. He has told the people of this country, in a late speech, that he is going to lop off the protective branches by degrees. He has no idea of slaugh-