

stands in the position of *quasi*-leader of his party in this House.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MACKENZIE. It seems incredible that such a speech as that made by my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) should pass unanswered by a single Minister. There has been no answer made by the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). I think the hon. gentlemen behind them should make way for some of the Ministers.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). They are not ready yet.

Mr. BOWELL. We are certainly under a great compliment to the hon. gentleman. I dare say the members of the Cabinet will take their own opportunity to speak.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are afraid to do it to day.

Mr. ORTON. I can hardly agree with the hon. member for Lambton in looking upon the speech of the hon. member for South Brant as one of such great importance, and especially of such importance to his side of the House. I think no member ever rose in this House who so well succeeded in advocating the cause of his opponents instead of that of his own side of the House, and think his whole argument goes to prove the success of the hon. member to the people of Canada. In the first place, he attempted to show that our export trade in manufactures had decreased. Do we not well know that one of the main objects of the National Policy was to give to the Canadian manufacturer the Canada markets? Is it surprising to him to find that the effect of the National Policy has been to do exactly what it was intended to do, and the manufacturers find it utterly impossible for them to-day to supply the demand in the home market for the various manufactures of this country, and the consequence is that they are not obliged to seek foreign markets for their manufactures. Furthermore, the facts show that the people of this country have increased their consuming power. They are not in that deplorable state in which they were previous to the inauguration of this policy. They do not now suffer from the hardships and trials they then suffered from. Our laboring men find employment in every city, town and village in the country, and the consequence is, they are enabled to buy more largely of manufactured goods. Our manufacturers are employed beyond the capacity of their machinery or their buildings, supplying the home demand, and the consequence is that manufacturers buy from one another, as hon. gentlemen are well aware, one class helping thereby to increase the prosperity of the other, the result being that they have benefitted largely by the operations of the National Policy. It has been distinctly shown by my hon. friend that such is the case, for in attempting to show that the increased export of farm products was a point against the National Policy, he gave a proof positive that the effect of that policy had been to some extent to stimulate the production of farm products. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that the effect of the National Policy has been to give to the farmers of this country an increased market of no less than \$5,000,000 annually; and if they have also increased their exports, it only shows that a greater stimulus to production has been given to our farmers. It is true that Providence has done a great deal, but we find that not only the agricultural, but the lumbering industry and every other industry has been stimulated, and why? Because the people of this country are all prospering. Building operations are going on in all parts of the country; they are using lumber extensively, and the result is that the home market for lumber alone has increased enormously. If the hon. gentleman desired to give an honest and candid statement to this House with regard to the National Policy he would be prepared to show by statistics whether our manufacturers had increased their productions or not; and if he could have shown that the manufacturers had not increased their production of

Mr. PLUMB.

manufactured goods, or that the lumbermen had not increased their production of lumber, he might then have said, with justice, that the effect of the National Policy was injurious to those interests. But I think he will find, before this House dissolves, that overwhelming evidence will be forthcoming to show that in every class of manufactures the amount produced has been enormously increased, and that not only has there been an increased exportation of many of these articles, such as lumber and farm produce, but that there has also been a very large increase in the home consumption, owing to the increased prosperity of the people. The hon. gentleman referred to the manufacturers in his own town, and he admitted warmly that he did not intend to insinuate that they were not prospering; but when he attempted to show that the effect of the National Policy had been to destroy manufacturing industries, it would have been in order for him to show that the manufacturers of Brantford had suffered in consequence of its adoption. But the hon. gentleman says they have not suffered, and why? Because they cannot supply the demand for manufactured goods in their own country, and as soon as they can do so they will appeal to the Government for a drawback, so as to enable them to compete with foreign countries, and increase the export of manufactured goods. I wish to say one thing in reference to the agricultural interests, and I will put it in the shape of a challenge to hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is that this side of the House will be able to show, not only that they have given to the Canadian farmer an increased home market, but that they have increased his prices as compared with those in Liverpool. They will be able to show that the various articles used by the farmer in everyday life—the articles of common consumption, such as cottons and many other classes of manufactured goods—are to-day sold cheaper to the farming, mechanical, and laboring classes, than ever before. These facts will be forthcoming in due time, and then I think even the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) will—if he honestly confesses his opinion, as I believe he desires to do—acknowledge that the National Policy after all has been a blessing to the people of Canada.

Mr. HESSON. As the hon. member for South Brant has chosen to color the figures he has used, for the purpose of conveying the impression that the country is in a worse state now than before the introduction of the present Tariff, I have taken the trouble to compile a few figures which, I think, I may submit to the judgment of the House, to show that the hon. member is far astray when he imagines he can pull the wool over the eyes of hon. members, or of people outside, by applying his statistics in a way that will not stand the light. I will take the export of farm products for three years, during the previous Administration of the present head of the Government, viz: the years 1871-72-73, and show that they were very much less than they were in the three last years of the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton; and as the times were adverse during those three years, the argument he has used with regard to the significance of the export trade will fall to the ground. In 1871, the exports of farm products were \$9,858,146; in 1872, they were \$13,378,562; and in 1873, \$14,395,340, a total export trade, during those three years, of \$37,632,048. I will now take the figures for the three last years of the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton, and show that the difference was largely in favor of that Government, though the bad times accompanied its administration of affairs. The exports of products of the farm, in 1876, were \$21,139,605; in 1877, \$14,689,876; in 1878, \$18,008,754; or a total, in the three years, of \$53,834,235. In other words, there was a difference of \$16,202,187 in favor of the late Administration, and yet I appeal to the House to say if its record was one to which even hon. gentlemen opposite