

elapse since they undertook to inaugurate this policy before they have taken the smallest or slightest pains to protect the family of the workingman, guard his safety and protect him against dangers which the framers of this report say, and say justly, at present exist in a great many factories in the Dominion. And let me tell the hon. gentlemen this, that they are doubly bound to see that these children are well taken care of, that they are not oppressed and ill-treated in the case of specially protected manufacturers, because the specially protected manufacturers are neither more or less than subsidized pensioners of the State, and the State which pensions them ought to look to them and see that such grievous wrongs and oppressions as this report reveals are not permitted to be exercised on 2,000 or 3,000 children in Canada. I will take the case, as the hon. gentleman desires, of the great bulk of the manufacturers of Canada. Those of which I have just spoken were specially protected, but I come now to the great bulk of the manufacturers. I repudiate entirely the attacks which the hon. Minister and his friends have from time to time made on us. I say they have no right whatever, from any utterances of mine or any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, to say we entertained the faintest or slightest feeling of hostility towards the manufacturers of Canada. Sir, the causes of their prosperity, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has done for them, lie in the single fact that the profits of our great industries have increased to a very large extent, and when the great bulk of our people became better able to purchase their products they in turn received a considerable share of prosperity; but as far as this Tariff is concerned the fact of the matter is simply this, that with respect to most of the manufacturers the Tariff has either directly injured them, or it has left them exactly where they were. What interest have these manufacturers in seeing that wages are raised, and under this Tariff wages must be raised all over or else the condition of the workingmen must be sensibly deteriorated, because in spite of the Finance Minister's statement, it is a well-known fact that a dollar to-day will not purchase within 10 or 15 per cent. as much as a dollar would purchase two years ago. What interest have the manufacturers in there being dearer freights, or duties on raw material in the shape of iron, or motive power in the shape of coal. Sir, the hon. Minister spoke just now of the increase in the production of coal. That may be, or it may not be. It would be very natural and very reasonable that, when the general prosperity of the country increases, the consumption of any one of the leading articles should increase; but I find that a large portion of the increased production is due to causes with which the hon. gentleman cannot pretend to have had anything to do. I am informed by hon. gentlemen conversant with the trade, that a very large proportion of the increased production of which the hon. gentleman boasts, particularly in Cape Breton, arises from the fact that it has now become the custom for vessels from New Orleans and other Atlantic ports to take a very considerable quantity of coal on board at that point to enable them to prosecute their voyage. If that be the case, it is a very desirable trade, and one which should be fostered, if the Government could foster it; but I have yet to learn in what way the Government can cause ocean going steamers to visit Cape Breton. There is another case in which a valuable trade is springing up, which would spring up more rapidly if it were not hampered by the Tariff. It is an export trade in manufactured lumber, such as doors and window sashes. There is a trade which I conceive it to be exceedingly desirable to cultivate, as it is one which would give employment to many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of people here; and how did the Government help this trade? This is an export trade, one subject to severe foreign competition, and the Government helped it by imposing additional taxes, which

amounted to about \$1 per thousand on the production of the lumber, which is the raw material entering into this kind of manufactured goods. All the hon. Minister can say is, that he had not injured the trade to quite that extent, but only to the extent of about one-half of \$1 per thousand. Speaking for myself, and in no way for anybody else on this side of the House, I may say this with respect to manufactures that I have always, when I was Minister of Finance, recognized as I do now, the plain and self-evident fact, that there must be heavy indirect taxation to produce a revenue; that while we are burdened with the obligations we are now burdened with, we cannot pretend to obtain that revenue without indirect taxation, but our policy was this: We desire to distribute that taxation justly. We held that that was best for the great bulk of the manufacturers that they had nothing then, as they have nothing now to fear from us; that they are far more likely to be injured by the Tariff exactions of the hon. gentlemen, and the domestic competition which he says rightly is the result in a great many cases. Our policy is to tax the people as lightly as we can, and when we are compelled to add to the taxes, to add to them justly and equally, avoiding all taxes which may press unduly on the poorer classes of the community, whom every statesman ought to guard, and from whom, especially when their incomes are small, you ought to avoid taking away any portion of that small wage they possess. Now to follow the hon. gentleman in this account of his expenditure and administration, we find that, practically, he has doubled our taxes. We know that he has doubled our expenditure since Confederation was inaugurated. We begin with 13½ millions of dollars, and find ourselves to-day with 27¼ million dollars demanded for the service of the coming year. Allow me to recall his statement that 22½ million dollars were sufficient for all reasonable purposes. Allow me to recall to your mind the innumerable denunciations with which this country rang, of the intolerable extravagances of my hon. friend, when he asked for \$23,500,000 for the public services. I do not know whether it was from ignorance of the facts, which he ought to have known, or from a not unnatural desire to diminish the weight of the enormous expenditure which he confessed he incurred, that the hon. gentleman was so anxious to make it appear that this expenditure of \$27,750,000, was really very little more than the expenditure of \$23,500,000. But I will explain to that hon. gentleman that the only reason why my hon. friend beside me was compelled, in the first two years of the term of his office, to expend somewhat more than he did in 1878, was this, that when that hon. gentleman opposite left office he left behind him a legacy of three or four million dollars to be expended in the various public works which he had put under construction in 1873-74; and that of our total expenditure in 1875-76, chargeable to income, at least \$1,250,000 is due to the works which had been put under contract, and for which votes had been taken by that hon. gentleman in 1873. That, and that only, is the reason why the expenditure of those two years was increased beyond the expenditure in 1878. The hon. gentleman will have to display a great deal more ingenuity than he has yet displayed before he will convince the people of Canada that an expenditure that has increased from \$23,500,000 in 1878 to \$27,750,000 in 1882, is an expenditure which can be justified, or which can be made consistent with his own declarations in 1878 before he obtained office. But the hon. gentleman talks of the percentage of taxes. I would like to call his attention to a few simple facts on that subject. I find that, in 1877, with a population of 3,250,000, we had a total taxation of \$11,700,000, and the average per head about \$3.60; in 1878, when our population was about 4,000,000, \$17,841,000, consequently an average per head to \$4.46. And even if he adds the \$1,000,000 deficit which then