

Wages—1850 to 1860	60 per cent.
" 1860 to 1870	102 currency
" 1870 to 1880	22 gold.
Products—1850 to 1860	85 per cent.
" 1860 to 1870	124 currency
" 1870 to 1880	26 gold.

Now, what do these figures show? They show that the increase in capital, in hands, in wages, in products, was very little greater under the stimulation of high protective duties from 1860 to 1870 than it was under the revenue tariff from 1850 to 1860, and they show that the increase in these various points was very much less under the protective duties from 1870 to 1880 than from 1850 to 1860. The average increase for twenty years was less than the average annual increase in the ten years under a revenue tariff. That is the record of the United States with regard to protection *vs.* a revenue tariff. It is worth while mentioning in this connection, that the popular vote in the United States in 1880 was 526,000 in favor of a revenue tariff, and that in 1884 a revenue tariff President has been elected by the popular vote after twenty years' trial of protection.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; it is worth hearing. It is suggestive. It points to a moral that we do well to heed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The language Mr. Cleveland used was just such language as would be used on our side of the House as to this policy.

Mr. CHARLTON. The language he used, the language his party uses, the language his supporters use, is that the tariff of the United States is an unjust and an oppressive tariff, and that duties should be levied for revenue purposes only. That is the plank on which Mr. Cleveland was elected President of the United States. We come now to the

Growth of Manufactures in Canada,

and I ask the hon. Minister's attention to the statistics I am about to quote.

They are very suggestive also. The more you look into them the more hollow the pretensions of the hon. gentleman seem. I will make a comparison with respect to the growth of manufactures in this country during the last ten years. It may be claimed that a part of this growth is due to the National Policy. I do not know to what extent the hon. gentleman would make that claim. But eight years of the ten years between 1871 and 1881 were under a revenue tariff. The change came in 1879, and you may fairly assume that the influences exercised by the National Policy, whatever they were, were not fairly brought into play until the expiration of a year, at least, and so nine of the ten years were passed under a revenue tariff policy. I assume that, I assert it, that of the decade between 1871 and 1881, nine of the ten years were under a revenue tariff, and whatever progress was made by the manufacturing industries of Canada, it was largely due to the operation of a revenue tariff policy. Let us see what the progress was. Here are the figures:—

CANADA.

Capital invested.

1871.....\$77,964,000	1881.....\$165,302,000
Increase.....\$87,338,000.	Per cent. 112.

Material consumed.

1871.....\$124,907,000	1881.....\$179,918,000
Increase.....\$55,011,000.	Per cent. 44.

Products.

1871.....\$221,617,000	1881.....\$309,616,000
Increase.....\$87,999,000.	Per cent. 39.

Hands employed.

1871.....187,942	1881.....254,983
Increase.....66,993.	Per cent. 35.

Wages paid.

1871.....\$40,851,000	1881.....\$59,429,000
Increase.....\$18,518,000.	Per cent. 45.

Ratio increase of population... 20.	
Ratio increase of Capital exceeds Ratio increase of Population 5 1/2 times.	
" " Material	" 2 1-5 "
" " Products	" 2 "
" " Hands	" 1 1/2 "
" " Wages	" 2 1/2 "
Increase exceeds U. S. decade, 1870 to 1880.	

				Capital 80 p. c.— or threefold
"	"	"	"	Material... 7 p. c.—
"	"	"	"	Products... 13 p. c.— ½ more.
"	"	"	"	Hands.... 4 p. c.—
"	"	"	"	Wages..... 23 p. c.— or double.