

and well-being of the country, is an item to which I will not take very great exception; but I take the opportunity to point out that hon. gentlemen opposite, when in Opposition, found fault with expenditures in the very Departments in which increases are now observable. We find that \$719,711 answered for the Customs Department in 1878-79, but now we are asked to vote for this service \$779,450, or an increase of \$59,729. Permit me here to say, I think that this is an expenditure which may fairly be justified, and I am not prepared to find fault with it. I am free to admit that the administration of this Department by the hon. Minister, who presides over it, has been remarkably economical, and it is but fair to give him credit for it; but I do not wish him to assume that I consider he has discharged his duty in all respects, because I have to find fault with some matters with reference to the administration of his Department; but he has kept closer to the line which he laid down for himself, than other hon. members of the Government who sit beside him have done. I wish I could say the same thing with reference to the Excise Department with which I have to find fault. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when in Opposition, denounced the extravagance of the Mackenzie Government, on account of the great cost attending its administration; but whereas that Government asked for \$211,064 for this Department in the year 1879, we are now asked to vote \$258,380 to do the same work, or \$77,316 more to do the work for the year 1884, than was necessary in 1879. Well, Sir, it cannot be alleged, as the hon. Minister of Customs might allege in his case, that there is an increase in the revenue from this Department, and a greater volume of merchandise handled, or greater traffic to be looked after; for we find that the revenue from Excise, in 1879, was \$5,390,763, while this year the hon. the Minister of Finance estimates receipts of \$5,400,000 from this source, being almost precisely the same as they were in the year 1879, and yet we are asked to expend \$77,316, or 33½ per cent. more for collecting this revenue than was demanded during the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, when they were denounced for their extravagance. In reference to it, Sir, I trust that the hon. Minister who presides over this Department, will give his attention to it, instead of devoting his time, which a Minister of the Crown should give to the duties of his Department, to other matters—now that the Ontario Elections are over—elections which did not concern that hon. gentleman in the slightest degree. I hope he will find it convenient to discharge the duties of his office, which should not suffer from his taking part in a Local Election in a Province to which he does not belong; and will see to it, that he rectifies the gross extravagance which pervades his Department, shown by the immense sum asked for it by the Government. With reference to the Post Office Department, we find that we are asked to vote \$453,887 more than was required in 1879. This item, I shall not criticise very closely, because I think that the hon. Finance Minister gave a reason—and a good reason, I will even go the length of saying—for this increase in this Department. We must expect it, while we are opening up a new country as we are doing in the immense North-West, and while providing necessary postal facilities, we must make up our minds to the fact that we must have an increased expenditure in this Department; and we will rejoice if the hon. gentleman is able next year, as he was to-day, to say that the increase in the revenue from this source was greater during the coming year than was the case during the past year. I think that the next point alluded to by the hon. the Finance Minister was the result of the working of the Tariff as between Great Britain and the United States; and he took credit to himself, while speaking on this subject, that the position which he had taken when it was discussed with a good deal of vigor in 1879, was fully justified by the returns; and that the position which was taken by hon. gentlemen on this side of the

House was not borne out by the facts. With an ingenuity that rather characterizes him—and which he is willing to ascribe to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, when it suits him to do so—he took certain years which made out apparently a case for himself; but I would ask him to take the bearing of the trade between Great Britain and the United States as it now exists. Why did not the hon. gentleman make a comparison in this respect between the years 1881 and 1882—years just following each other. Let us not go back five or six years to see whether the Tariff works as he represents. What are the facts with reference to these two years? Have the imports from Great Britain increased in greater ratio than the imports from the United States. No; but quite the reverse. Instead of the position of the hon. gentleman being borne out by the facts, the position of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House is fully borne out. What are the figures which are furnished by the hon. Minister of Customs himself, and therefore thoroughly reliable. In 1882, there entered into consumption, of imports from Great Britain, \$50,597,341 worth; and, in 1881, the imports from the same country amounted in value to \$43,583,808; or we had an increase in the imports from Great Britain of goods entering into consumption in the year 1882, over the year 1881, of \$7,014,533. Well, then, we had entered for consumption, in imports from United States in the year 1882, \$48,289,052 worth; and, in 1881, we had from them but \$36,704,112 worth; or we had an increase, in the imports from the United States, in 1882 over 1881, of \$11,584,940, against an increase in imports from Great Britain of \$7,014,533; and yet the hon. Finance Minister thinks that his position is borne out by the facts, and that the operation of the Tariff is such that the imports from Great Britain have increased, while the imports from the United States have decreased. Well, Sir, with reference to the duties paid on these goods, what are the facts? With regard to the \$50,000,000 and over imported from Great Britain in 1882, we collected a duty of \$10,011,811, which is as near as may be 20 per cent.; and, in 1881, on \$43,583,808 of imports from that country, the duty collected amounted to \$8,772,949, or the same average duty of 20 per cent. Now, what was the amount of the duty collected on the goods imported from the United States? On the \$48,289,052 worth of goods imported from the United States in 1882, the duty collected was \$7,082,722, or only 15 per cent., as against 20 per cent. on British goods.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes; hear, hear. The hon. Finance Minister says, "hear, hear," but he will not deny that I have stated the figures correctly.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; but the fact is misleading, Mr. Speaker, because he required to look at the rate of duty collected in 1878 in order to reach a correct conclusion as to the effect of the Tariff.

Mr. PATERSON. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the conclusion is very misleading if applied to the conclusions drawn by the hon. Finance Minister; but it is anything but misleading when applied to the point which I am making. I have shown, I think, that the duty paid on British imports exceeded 20 per cent. in the years 1881 and 1882, while the duty on the United States imports in each case was 15 per cent.; and I pointed out that from the year 1881 to 1882 the imports from Great Britain increased but \$7,000,000, while the imports during the same period from the United States increased over \$11,000,000. Therefore these figures effectually disprove the position taken by the hon. Finance Minister, and fully establish what was contended for by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Now, let me say here, if it will be any comfort to the hon. gentleman—and in this matter I speak