

the removal of that depression has been falsely attributed to the National Policy; and if the National Policy had not been adopted, I firmly believe that the manufacturers of Canada would have made as good progress and would have been in a more healthy condition to-day than they are now under the operation of that policy.

Percentage of Cost Chargeable to Wages.

Now, Sir, I have one little fact to present to the House, which I think will convince any candid member that the protection we afford is higher than necessary. One of the arguments of protectionists is that it is necessary to protect the manufacturer because he pays higher wages than are paid in England—it is claimed in the United States that the wages are 60 to 70 per cent. higher than in England. Well, we will admit that it is necessary to afford a degree of protection that will enable the manufacturer to pay double the wages paid in Great Britain—what amount of protection would be required? What percentage of the cost of the fabrics and wares produced in this country and produced in the United States is chargeable to wages? That is the question. The census returns of the United States show that 17 per cent. of the cost of the products of the manufacturers is the cost of the wages paid to the operatives, and the balance is due to the raw material and other charges. Our census returns show that 19 $\frac{1}{2}$ of the cost of fabrics produced by our manufacturers is chargeable to wages. Well, Sir, if you are going to enable the manufacturer of Canada to pay double the wages paid in England, how much protection does he want to overcome that? Why, he wants one-half of that 19 per cent., he wants 10 per cent. protection, 10 per cent. higher prices, in order to enable him to pay double the wages paid in England, because the total cost of the wages to him is 19 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In the United States 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. protection is sufficient to enable the manufacturer to pay double the wages paid in Great Britain; and so the

people of this country have been deceived as to the degree of protection necessary in order to enable our manufacturers to meet what they claim are the additional burdens imposed upon them as compared with Great Britain.

Progress under Revenue Tariff and Protection Contrasted.

Now, Sir, I promised a few moments ago to show that the progress of manufactures in this country and the progress of manufactures in the United States had been satisfactory, healthy, and rapid under a revenue tariff policy. We have seen, in the United States, a period of revenue tariff policy extending from the year 1846 to 1860; and we have seen a period of a protective policy extending from 1861 down to the present date. Now if we take the returns from the United States for the four years between 1846 and 1850, under this revenue tariff policy, and if we take the decade between 1850 and 1860, passed entirely under the operation of a revenue tariff policy, which was well settled and had been in operation four years before the decade commenced, and compare the progress made by the manufacturing industries of that decade with the progress made in the two succeeding decades, we will have the data upon which to form an opinion as to whether manufacturers did really get an advantage under the revenue tariff, and as to whether a protective tariff is essential to their development. Now, I shall not trouble the House with a table I have here, which goes exhaustively into the capital, the material used, the amount of production, the amount paid, the wages, and the number of hands; but I will point out the percentages of increase under these various heads during the three decades:

Capital—1850 to 1860	89 per cent.
" 1860 to 1870	109 currency
" 1870 to 1880	31 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent.
Hands—1850 to 1860	37 per cent.
" 1860 to 1870	47 "
" 1870 to 1880	31 "

Wages—

"

Product

"

"

Now, v
show
hands,
little g
high pr
than it
1850 to
increas
much 1
from 18
The ave
less tha
in the t
That is
with re
tariff.
ing in t
vote in
526,000
that in
has bee
twenty
Sir
hear.
Mr.
hearing
a mora
Sir
guage
languag
the Ho
Mr.
used, t
guage
of the
oppress
be lev
That is
was e
States

Gro

and I
to the