

Canada or the imports from other countries. The result was that, instead of obtaining an increase to the revenue, the revenue fell to what it was in 1874 before the increases were made, and the people refused to bear the burden that was imposed upon them. How was it in 1879? We asked parliament to give us such changes in the Tariff as would not only protect the industries of the country, but give us an increased revenue. Was there a response? I stated at the outset that the response was ample provided the money had been paid in for the year 1879 that belonged to that year. And in the year that followed, what was the response? They gave us a surplus of four million dollars and upwards, because we found employment for the people; because, by obtaining for them employment and higher wages, they were able to buy more than formerly. Men who owned bank stock had greater value in it than in 1878-79; men who had tenements unoccupied in 1878-79, had tenants for their houses, and the additional revenue thus received on all hands enabled them to buy more than in previous years. Men who were formerly working at half time and on low wages received higher wages and were working over-time. Farmers who had low prices and found sales difficult received high prices and prompt cash sales. The result was that, while we estimated the capacity of our people to contribute, during the year, \$17,000,000 for Customs to the Treasury, they paid in, voluntarily—because it was to a great extent voluntarily—\$18,500,000. I say voluntarily, because, of the increases of last year over the previous year, \$778,000 was paid in luxuries, such as wines, spirits, silks and satins, and articles of that kind. That indicates very clearly that the people had the means, and having the means they contributed more in that way than before. In the finer description of woollen goods, for instance, which are not manufactured in Canada, they contributed \$400,000 more to the Treasury than last year. In the article of cottons, which pay 20 per cent., they contributed \$300,000 more than in the year before. All this shows an increased purchasing power on the part of the people. We under-estimated their improved condition when we estimated that they would only contribute \$17,000,000; they contributed \$18,500,000. One important feature in this connection is, that though we expended for Public Works \$8,150,000 during that year, and redeemed about \$2,000,000 existing liabilities, bearing 6 per cent., the surplus of over \$4,000,000, with the amount of deposits in the savings banks of the Dominion, \$4,750,000, enabled us to meet these payments chargeable to capital, and still our interest account was less by \$90,000 than the year before. But I qualify that in this way: we paid \$90,000 less interest than the year previous; but, if we take the statement of the interest that was due for the year, and count it as all paid—though it was not all paid within the year—there would be still \$25,000 less interest than in the year previous, notwithstanding the increase of the expenditure on debt account. Now, it has been said that this surplus was an unnecessary burden on the people, that it ought not to have been imposed; but gentlemen who hold that view, and say that it is unwise to have a surplus of three or four million dollars, have, at the same time, stated that the United States are paying off their debt at the rate of \$100,000,000 per year and commend them for so doing; and assert that, unless we look carefully after our affairs, we will be subjected to burdens which, in view of the fact that their debt will speedily be wiped out, and they will have little or no taxation, will place us at a great disadvantage with them. Well, Sir, I cannot quite see, if it is desirable, in the opinion of those gentlemen, that there should be a surplus in the United States for the purpose of paying off their debt, that it is objectionable on the part of the Dominion of Canada to have a surplus, especially when it is collected under the

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

circumstances to which I refer. Sir, it is customary, I find, with our friends opposite, when addressing either their own constituents or other constituencies in different parts of the Dominion of Canada, to refer to the present state of things as alone the result of large exports during the last two or three years, and if I am rightly informed, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) stated that the present condition of affairs in Canada was not the result of the National Policy, but it was the result of large exports and a large receipt of gold coming into the country. Well, Sir, I find that that hon. gentleman and other hon. members, when they are speaking of the condition of the country, or when they are speaking of the position of the late Government and of the present Government with reference to their expenditure, are very apt to select one particular period against another period; one particular year, for instance, during the administration of the hon. gentleman opposite against a particular year of the present Administration. So, in the case to which I am now referring, the hon. member refers to the exports during the past year, 1881, and he says that the present condition of the country is to be attributed to that large export. Would it not be well, Mr. Speaker, for hon. gentlemen opposite, when they are making a comparison between the condition of the country under the two Governments, and embracing different periods, that they should select the whole period; for instance, that they should select the five years during which our hon. friends were in power and the two or three years during which the present Government have been in power, rather than select one particular year. It might not be convenient for the hon. member to do so; but I have had made up a statement to show that the present state of the country cannot be the result of largely-increased exports of the products of Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will read them, and then I will challenge the hon. member to show that they are not correct. In 1874, the exports of Canadian products, including Canadian manufactures, were \$73,926,748; in 1875, they were \$67,490,893; in 1876, \$69,861,849; in 1877, \$65,864,880; in 1878, \$65,740,134; or an average for the five years of \$68,576,901. In 1879, they were \$60,089,578; in 1880, \$70,096,191; in 1881, \$80,921,379; making an average, for the three years, of \$70,369,049, an increase per annum of \$1,792,148. Now, Sir, the present state of affairs is not dependent upon the exports alone of the products of Canada—considering the average population during that period, and the average population during the past three years—he will find that the then state of the country as compared with the present, or the present condition of the country as compared with its condition then, is not due entirely, as he claims it is to that cause or to causes quite outside the National Policy. I call his attention to that, because it is of importance to show that during the five years that our friends opposite were in power, the value of the exports, being products of Canada, was but \$1,700,000 a year less, with a smaller population, than it was during the three years the present Administration have been in power. Moreover, hon. gentlemen very often take up the expenditure of 1877-78, by the late Government, and they compare it with the expenditure of last year, and then point to it as an evidence of the extravagance of this extravagant Government. Sir, I am prepared to show, from the data I have before me, that, if the hon. gentlemen opposite had collected from Customs, Excise and Stamp Duty, money enough to pay their expenditure, and if the present Administration had collected simply money enough to pay theirs, that upon the average population of the five years they were in power, and the three years we have been in office, the figures show that 23 cents per head less would have been collected from the people