

to it by a gentleman on the Opposition side of the House, denied, at that time, by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, who subsequently had to admit it, however.

Mr. BOWELL. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, he changed.

Mr. BOWELL. I never made any denial. I said, when the Tariff was first under discussion, that the principle of allowing an equivalent to be used instead of the actual product was not only discussed, but was affirmed in that debate, and the hon. gentleman knows that.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman said that I had not interpreted it right. I say, I proved I was right on that occasion, and that the hon. the Minister of Customs, though thinking I was not right at that time, very soon found out that I must have been right, judging from the fact that he passed another Order in Council in which the phraseology was changed, requiring them to export the product of the same wheat that was imported.

Mr. BOWELL. That is quite true, but I did not make any such denial as you attribute to me.

Mr. PATERSON. I accept what the hon. gentleman says. But I think the hon. gentleman said I did not give a proper interpretation; I accept his statement. Now, let me call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance to the agricultural protection, and to his reasoning in reference to it. There is something very strange, when he touches upon this agricultural protection. I find that he says in his speech, made this year, that through the imposition of this 15 cents a bushel on wheat the Canada farmer gets 3 cents a bushel more than otherwise practicable; that at a certain season of the year when the farmers are sold short it would be possible to get a higher price by a duty on wheat, and he goes on to say that the cost of the transmission of that particular kind of wheat from Chicago to Liverpool was precisely the cost from Toronto to Liverpool by the Grand Trunk Railway and the Allan line of steamers. Therefore, if the price depended on the English market, that wheat would have had to go down 3 cents more; because as we know, after a large portion has been shipped to England, the quantity of Canadian grain in the country being diminished, the Canadian millers have to pay an increased price for their wheat, which goes into the pockets of our farmers, who reap the benefit, and, therefore, the millers have either to go to the United States market and pay the duty, or pay the price demanded by the Canadian farmers. Consequently, ten days ago they received 3 cents a bushel more for their wheat than had our markets been open to the Americans, and exposed to the danger of being broken down by the shipments from the other side. What does the hon. the Finance Minister mean by this? Why does the Canadian farmer, by this duty of 15 cents on wheat, get 3 cents a bushel more? Because he says he would not sell his wheat unless the Canadian miller gave him his price, and, if the miller went to the United States, he would have to pay 15 cents more. If that be so, why, I ask the hon. the Finance Minister, does he not ask more than 3 cents a bushel extra? Why, if the miller must pay what the farmer asks, does he stop at 3 cents—why not ask 10 cents or 12 cents? The matter must be explained on some other ground than the 15 cent duty. Take the article of wool, and see how the farmer was treated by the Government. They told him they would put a duty on wool that would enhance its price. What are the facts? The first year they imposed no duty on wool. The next year the farce is gone through of imposing a duty on sorts we were not importing. The Trade and Navigation Returns for 1880 showed that some 6,000,000 lbs. of wool were imported without paying duty; in 1881, 8,000,000

lbs. entered without paying one cent of duty. The farce was again gone through of placing duty on other things, which hon. gentlemen opposite knew would not have the slightest effect in enhancing their price. Now, with reference to another class in the community, the mechanics and artisans, I take this ground—and I have thought a good deal upon this subject—that it is the bounden duty of the men entrusted with the affairs of this great country to recognize the fact that there are other men besides the manufacturers whose interests ought to be conserved at their hands. While I am willing and anxious, and while the Government I supported and the party I am connected with were and are willing to arrange the Tariff as to give fair protection to manufacturers, they felt and feel bound, at the same time, to do fairly with them; to not place these men in a position to extort heavy prices from the consuming classes. When you remember that the National Policy does this, that while it gives to certain manufacturers 35, 40, and 50 per cent. protection, it leaves the mechanics and artisans who work in those factories without it—while we, the manufacturers, are protected against the competition of foreign countries, the men by whose energies we are enriched are not protected in the slightest degree, our labor market being open to the whole world, foreign artisans may come in, under-bid them, and take away their living. I do not intend, of course, to put a duty on labor; but I say this, while the labor is left untaxed, the articles purchased by the laborer should not be heavily burdened. That is the principle we war against, and not against the manufacturers, but against a Tariff that would give them an illegitimate amount of protection. We are told that hon. Ministers have made the times better. All the credit for the prosperity of the country is arrogated by them, by virtue of their legislature. It was pointed out by the hon. gentleman who preceded me in this debate, and by myself in a few remarks I offered on a motion made the other day, and for the making of which I was found fault with by the hon. the Finance Minister, who said I desired to anticipate him—it was stated also by the hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon, that I wished to anticipate that hon. gentleman by requiring a reply to my motion, although my remarks had an entirely different object, being intended to elicit information that would enable us to determine on the question in which some of my constituents were interested—I say that on that occasion I pointed out that the prosperity of the country had been brought about by the fact that within the last two years there had been \$30,000,000 extra gold brought into the country, as a result of extra sales of lumber, animals and other agricultural products. I also stated that unless the hon. gentlemen opposite could claim the power of raising the price of lumber in the United States market, compelling Heaven's rain to fall on our fields, and of raising the price of grain in the British market, that those \$30,000,000 could not be credited to them, and I argue that through the operation of this \$30,000,000, circulated through this country, manufacturers have experienced an impetus that would bring about the result we have witnessed—peace, plenty and prosperity in our country. But the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the Finance Minister, said: we will show the hon. gentlemen in Opposition, that our prosperity could not have come from the large increase of exports. A more rash statement was never uttered. That \$30,000,000 should be brought in and not produce an effect in the shape of greater prosperity is a statement so rash that the Finance Minister should not have ventured upon it. Why, any one can understand what the effect of such a benefit would be in this country. He claims that the whole prosperity the country is enjoying, is due to the beneficial effects of his National Policy; but as a proof he furnishes us with a list of industries that it has brought into