The Canadian Post.

CHAS. D. BARR, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.] [POSTAGE PREPAID BY THE PUBLISHER.

Vol. XIX. Whole Number 981. LINDSAY, ONT., FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1878. Terms, $1.50 in Advance.

SIR JOHN A.'S LAMENT.

BY AN OUTSIDERARIAN.

Ah! woe is me
That ever I
To get the golden egg,
Should play the dunce,
And kill the goose,
And now be forced to beg.

That Huntington
He spoil'd my fun,
But Allan bears the loss,
Which I'll repay
The very day
That I again am boss.

Protection is
My last resort,
Yet, 'tis my only fear
Thus those who've read
Whas I have said
Through life until this year,

Will see that?
Have turned my coat
And then to turn my pow'r,
Lest like the dog,
Return again
My vomit to devour.

Ah me! those Grits
Will give me fits
If they remain in pow'r;
If they abide
Then suicide
Shall mark my dying hour.

For life, to me,
A burden would be
To sit for five years more
And not have pow'r
For one short hour
Mackenzie to rule o'er.

—*St. Thomas Journal.*

HON. ALEX. MACKENZIE.

THE PREMIER'S GREAT SPEECH TO THE TORONTO WORKING MEN.

Telling Exposure of Protection Fallacies—Evil Consequences of Protection in the States—The True Policy for Canada.

Mr. Mackenzie's address to the workingmen of Toronto, two days after the Lindsay Demonstration, was one of the most effective and telling exposures of the fallacies of protection that have been delivered. After reviewing briefly the state of England before and after the abolition of the Corn Laws, and showing the injurious effects of protection upon workingmen as thereby exemplified, Mr. Mackenzie drew a most instructive lesson from the experience of the United States, where the Protectionists have had their own way for years. We make room for this part of the Premier's speech, and we doubt not it will receive careful study from the electors of Victoria.

The United States and Canadian Tariffs Compared.

We may now compare very fairly the effect of restrictive laws in the neighboring country—that is, compare the United States system with the Canadian system, and see how the results are worked out in the prosperity or adversity of either country. The people of the United States are akin in origin to ourselves; they are of the same blood and the same language; they possess the same inventive power, the same genius for conducting the government of a free country; they are a people whose marvellous adaptation to everything that relates to human progress is most marked. They imagine themselves, indeed, to be far ahead of Britain and British dependencies in that respect. I do not admit that any superiority of the kind belongs to them. (Hear, hear.) But I do assert at once that we are on a footing of perfect equality with them in that particular. (Hear, hear.) They have the same boundless capacity, are on the same footing of equality as to the means of making labor productive and making a people happy. They are not oppressed by any tyrant, and they make their own laws. We are oppressed by no tyrant either; we meet here as free men to discuss the public affairs of a nation. (Cheers.) We meet here to consider those great principles which have for their object the greatest amount of human happiness, and for their ultimate result national grandeur, or if the laws should be unjust, national failure. I propose to examine a few of the effects of the laws of the United States, as compared with the effects of Canadian laws bearing upon human industry, and consequently upon human happiness. Those who have not resided in the States poitry or history may not be aware that the real protective era only commenced with 1860; for many years before that, that country had a purely revenue tariff. Occasionally before 1860 they passed duties which partook largely of the nature of a protective tariff; but in 1860, just about the time that the war broke out manufacturers and others interested in particular speculations succeeded to a certain extent in getting a hold upon the legislative power and upon the Government of the country, and the result of that was the enactment of laws which levied duties that were prohibitory in their character, as it was utterly impossible for any foreign country to send articles into the United States, which persons in the United States were capable of producing. The people of the United States were not, of course, able to exclude silk goods, certain qualities of woollen goods, and some other articles. Now, we propose to show you by actual facts that it was impossible for them to do two things at once in the manner that they thought they could—that is, by means of a prohibitory tariff to supply the entire home market with all the manufactured articles required and at the same time send goods to foreign countries to compete in their markets. What is said by our manufacturers is this, "Give us enough protection to get our manufactories fairly established, and we will then be able to compete with foreigners and to maintain entire control of our home markets."

Effects of Protection in the States.

Well, sir, let us look at the result of such a policy in the United States. After ten years of protection they succeeded in acquiring a pretty large amount of manufacturing power and productiveness. By the census of 1870 we learn that the goods manufactured in the United States amounted in value to $4,232,325,000, or about in round numbers, $4,250,000,000. They had at this time arrived at the greatest degree of prosperity which they ever enjoyed, and from thenceforward there was a steady decline. In 1876 the amount of their manufactured goods had fallen—that is, in four years—to the extent of $732,000,000, the entire export of manufactured goods from the United States in 1876 being $60,500,000, as near as possible two per cent. of the entire amount of their total manufactures, showing that they were utterly unable to compete in foreign markets with any considerable staple manufactures of the country. Now let us take one or two instances to illustrate the relative positions of trade in the United States under the different tariff systems. In 1876 the entire produce of her iron manufactures was as near as may be $100,000,000. The total exports of that production amounted only to $688,612, or eleven-sixteenths of one per cent. of the entire produce of their manufactures. This showed that they were utterly unable to compete in the markets of the world with English and other manufacturers who had no protection whatever to sustain them. Let us take again the woollen manufacturers of the United States. They had a protection of something like 60 per cent. through the greater portion of the period from 1860 to 1876. The total amount of their produce in 1876 was $134,000,000, while their exports only reached the figure of $683,883, and at the same time they were compelled to admit woollen products from foreign countries that their protection did not enable them to manufacture themselves, to the extent of $47,670,065. In 1876 the United States manufacturers of clothing made altogether goods to the value of $160,000,000, and they exported altogether $570,395 worth, or almost exactly one-third of one per cent. of their total product. To such a state were the manufacturers of the United States reduced that they were utterly unable to send a particle almost of their whole product to foreign countries, while England, and other countries which had either entire free trade or a revenue tariff, were able to send their goods to Asia, to the West Indies, to the South American Republics, to Africa, to the East Indies, and to almost every civilized nation on the globe, and completely to shut out the American manufacturer from the trade of the world. There are some before me who will also remember the restrictive laws which affected the ships of Great Britain. At one time within the memory of very many who are present England prevented any foreign ships from being brought into the country—prevented any foreign ships from carrying any portion of the produce of Great Britain coastwise. There is no doubt that whenever a protective system is adopted it will for a time increase the productions of a country—the manufactured productions of a country—but I wish to argue this matter out, and I think I shall be able to show you that, although it will increase them for a time, it is only ultimately the cause of terrible wreck and ruin amongst the manufacturers who have so greatly increased the production of the country.

Over-Production of Manufactures.

In the United States, when the tariff of 1860 was adopted, the entire value of products in manufactures was about $65 per head; but in 1870, in ten years of a protective system, the annual average had increased to about $123 per head, or very nearly double of what it was in 1860—although a very considerable part of that annual value in 1870 is to be deducted in order to find the real ratio value of that day. The discount upon American money at that time was such as would reduce the average per capita from $123 to, as Mr. David Wells calculates, something between $90 and $100 per head; still it was an immense increase in the production of a country, and this same tendency to manufacture is always sure to increase much faster than the ratio of increase of population. For instance, in 1870 the number of cotton spindles in the United States was 7,114,000; but in 1874 it had increased to 9,415,388, or in the ratio of 33 per cent. during these four years, while the population had only increased 11 per cent. You will observe from this that the manufactures of the country were being produced much faster than they could be consumed, and thus leading as a matter of course to one of two things—to compel the manufacturers to find a larger market, or not to make so many goods. They tried to obtain a larger market, but they failed for the reason that it cost so much in the United States to produce what they were making. When they shipped their goods to other parts they were outsold by free trade England, and the result was that within a few years afterwards the producing capacity of the United States began seriously to retrograde. Take the State of Pennsylvania alone, where there was an unlimited field for the production of iron. There were in that State in 1870 not less than 800 iron blast furnaces in operation. At the present time more than one-half of these blast furnaces are idle, and one hundred millions of capital sunk in that work is utterly unproductive. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) This shows that the protective system had brought on such an overproduction that it became the ruin of the producers. (Hear, hear.) And so it would be in Canada if we were all willing to tax ourselves over and above what was necessary for revenue purposes for the promotion of the interest of certain manufacturers; we would merely succeed in making a few manufacturers wealthy for a few years at the expense of the rest of the people, and so many would rush into business that the makers would produce more than could be sold. It would be produced at such an enormous cost that they would be unable to send any out of the country, and in such large quantities that we would be unable to use it in the country. In a short time, therefore, manufacturers would have to shut up their shops. Universal ruin to the manufacturers themselves would be the inevitable result of thus gorging the market by an unhealthy system of protection. We have here the fact, and I am now speaking from figures of an official character, that while the population of the United States increased from thirty-one millions in 1860 to forty-five millions in 1875, for the sixteen years inclusive at a rate of about 46 per cent., the producing capacity, as I have already shown, increased during the same period in a much larger ratio. In 1876 the United States were not able to export goods in proportion to the population, for their exportation relatively decreased in proportion to the population. The export of cotton piece goods in 1860 amounted to nearly $11,000,000, but in 1876, with a population of nearly fifteen millions more, and with a protective system which is claimed by our protectionist friends to be the means of enriching the country, they were only able to export seven and three-quarter millions, an absolute decrease in the exportation of one of their staple manufactures of 25 per cent., besides the relative decrease as compared with the increase of the population. (Hear, hear.) Now, could any fact be more damning as to the influence of a protective system upon the trade of a country. (Hear, hear.) A voice—"That is not caused by protection." Well, I can only say that all the political economists admit that it is caused by protection. (Cheers.) I can only say that it is caused by something, and they have protection there while there is no protection in England. A voice—"What has free trade done for us? We have never had free trade, and therefore you cannot tell what it has done for Canada. I have a list here of manufactured goods exported from the United States, embracing some of their principal staples, such as tobacco, iron, cotton piece goods, drugs, medicines, wearing apparel, glass, hats, paper, printing presses, type, and many other things, and we find that in 1880 there were twenty-nine millions exported of these twenty or thirty articles in this list, and only the same amount in 1876, notwithstanding the increase in population. This shows the ruinous effect of a protective tariff. (Hear, hear.) Now I am not pretending for a moment to say that it would be desirable or possible for us to have what is known as a free trade system. The Government of which I am a member is accused of having a free trade policy, whereas the fact is that the necessities of our revenue compel us to impose a higher duty than was imposed by the previous Administration; in other words, we have 17½ per cent. when the late Administration had only 15 per cent. (Hear, hear.)

Beneficial Effects of Unrestricted Trade.

I was about to speak of the exportation of certain articles of goods to one little State in South America (Venezuela) as an illustration. In 1870 the entire import and export trade amounted to $8,345,000. The principal exports from Venezuela consist of coffee and raw hides. The United States had a large duty upon both of these articles, but in 1870 they admitted coffee free of duty into the United States, and they had hides free also, and the result was an immediate increase in the trade in these articles. In 1876 the imports alone from Venezuela were of the value of $6,870,000, and the exports $8,424,000, or an increase of 209 per cent. as compared with 1870. Then in 1872 there was a still further proof of the beneficial effects of a reduction of duties from the protectionist standard. In 1870 the entire shipping trade with Venezuela amounted to fifteen vessels of only 2,570 tons capacity and employing only 100 hands. In 1876, after only four years of comparative free trade, the ships from the United States engaged in that traffic amounted to 132 against 15 in the protectionist time, with 43,000 tons as against 2,500 in the same period, and employing 1,255 hands as against 100. Another still more conclusive argument, however, is to be found in the figures relating to the manufactures and exports of tanned leather. In 1872 hides were made free, and in that year the entire exports of tanned leather from the United States amounted to $2,864,000, while in 1876, after four years of a comparative free trade era, they had risen to $7,940,000, or very nearly $8,000,000, as against $2,750,000 four years before. Nothing could show more clearly than this the beneficial effects of removing the restrictions from trade.

Evidences of a Country's Prosperity.

Now, sir, one of the tests by which we are always to gauge the prosperity of a country is the amount of goods its people are able to consume themselves. It is supposed, for instance, by many, that Great Britain lives entirely by her foreign trade, while the most recent financial authorities in Great Britain compute the entire profit of British producers and capitalists at £1,400,000,000 per annum—that is, the profits arising from the interest derived from investments in railways and foreign bonds, as well as the profits of the manufactures in the country, and goods which are consumed in it—in other words the income of the country. But the entire amount of the foreign trade—that is, the export of goods to foreign parts—last year was only £300,000,000 sterling, or exactly one-seventh part of the whole, and that figure included goods shipped which had been imported in a raw state. Now, sir, the United States exportation in 1876 altogether of domestic produce was $662,327,000 worth, or an average per capita of $13.69. Canada exported during the same year, with less than an eleventh of their population, $72,491,437 worth, or an average rate of $18.48 per head, against $13.30 per head in the United States. (Cheers.) And to show that this was not at all an exceptional year, let us take the next year, viz., 1877, when the exports from Canada had somewhat decreased, and the exports from the United States had somewhat increased, in consequence of their indebtedness in foreign countries. A huge amount of export is not always a true measure of the prosperity of a country. A farmer who is deeply in debt is often under the necessity of providing for that debt by selling more of his stock than he can well part with, and to that extent he diminishes the productive power of his farm; for instance, if he tries to do with five horses what he requires six to do properly, in order that he may sell the sixth to pay interest on a debt, he indeed shows a greater amount of sales in the year, but it is at the expense of his prosperity. Well, sir, the United States during the year ending June 30, 1877, exported of domestic products, in gold value, $589,620,224 worth, or at average per head of $12.65; Canada exported during that year—and you all millionaire that the year 1876-7 was one of the most unexampled depression, unexampled at least since the year 1857—the very worst year we had—to the amount of $68,030,546, or an average of $17.30 per head, being in excess of the United States exports at the rate of $5.46 per head. (Cheers.) (A voice—"How much did we buy?") We bought nothing we have not been able to pay for. (Hear, hear.)

Decrease of United States Exports under a Protective Tariff.

I have a table here showing the entire exports of manufactured goods from the year 1860 to the year 1876 from the United States. They exported in that year, when they had only a revenue tariff such as we have now—that is in 1860—with a population of little over thirty-one millions, $316,242,422, or as nearly as possible $10 per head. Now, it was believed that with protection to enable manufacturers to accomplish a complete establishment of their business, the production of the country would be so increased that they would be able to flood foreign markets with their produce. Well, sir, what was the result? In 1877, after seven years of a protection period, the exports of manufactured goods had decreased to $7.67 per head, so that as protection advanced the exports of goods decreased, and it was only after 1871, when a serious and continuous stagnation of business set in, and the manufacturers of the United States were compelled to sell at any prices which could be realized, when they were compelled to sell in order to pay their debts and prevent their manufactories and mills being shut up, that there was a slight rally in the ratio of the export of manufactured goods. And even in 1876, when they were sending goods into this country and into other countries at prices far below their value, it only reached $11.60; while in free Canada in that same year we exceeded them by $6.38 per head. (Cheers.)

How Restrictive Laws affect Workingmen.

But I do not forget that I am addressing workingmen. I do not forget that I have risen to the position I now occupy from the ranks of the workingmen. I have done my full share of the hard work of this world. (Cheers.) But I would be sorry indeed to see amongst my fellow-countrymen such an absence of thought and intelligence as would induce them to adopt a system which could only result in beggary and serfdom. (Cheers.) What does it matter to you workingmen whether you are in subjection to some tyrant who rules out to you what he pleases as wages, or whether you are under a tyranny of laws which prevent you buying where you please and selling where you like? (Cheers.) That is the point we have come to. What was the condition of the workingman during this period of which I have striven to give you a brief history, illustrated by figures which cannot be controverted? Sir, the workingman's wages undoubtedly rose, and taking the average wages of about twenty classes of artizans, embracing all artizans in the building trade and all engaged in the leading manufactures, the wages rose about 60 per cent. from 1860 to 1870; that is, the man who was getting a dollar in 1860 in the United States daily wages, was getting $1.60 a day in 1870. Now, sir, this fact simply stated would seem to bear out the proposition that protection is beneficial to the laboring man. But, sir, with the rate of wages the price of materials rose in a still higher ratio. (Hear, hear.) Rents rose in a still higher ratio—everything that was necessary for the workingman to have—everything that was conducive to his health and livelihood—rose in the proportion of 92 per cent. as against the 60 per cent. that wages rose. (Hear, hear.) It does not matter to you one or two whether our wages are a dollar or a shilling if the price of commodities correspond. Why, sir, one hundred and fifty years ago a shilling would go further in England than two will now, and if it took $1.92 to buy what only $1.60 was given to purchase, the laboring man, as you will see, was in 1870 32 per cent. worse off than he was before the protection era commenced. But what is the state of matters now? From 1870 down to 1877 there has been a steady declinature of wages in the United States, and at this moment the United States laborer and artisan get less wages than the Canadian laborer and artisan—positively less in amount, and very far less in the purchasing power of that amount. If we desire to protect a particular industry, you must either protect all other industries at the same time, or you take a course unjust to the people; and if you protect all industries alike, that means raising prices universally, but not making them a bit better. If, for instance, I have to go to the butcher and pay him 15 cents for what I bought before for 10, what does it amount to? If my wages are five cents an hour more? Depend upon it the best policy for any country is one under which you raise simply the amount of taxes that is necessary to carry on the affairs of the State: not one which requires the community to tax itself to any member of it, but one which makes the country as cheap a country as you can live in. (Hear, hear.) For it is where there is a cheap livelihood for the workingman that the workingman is the most prosperous. Sir, these gentlemen speak loudly about protecting our industries. What does protecting our industries mean? They talk, sir, about being the friends of the workingman, those who are thus clamoring to get you to put your necks in the noose, and to accept a policy which would be utterly fatal to your happiness and prosperity, and to the welfare and prosperity of the country, of which every workingman is a unit. (Cheers.)

The Existing Canadian Tariff.

Now, sir, let us take a glance at the effect of even the existing tariff upon the productions of the country. You are aware that boots and shoes are made extensively in Canada, and you are also aware that the duty upon that article is 17½ per cent. So far as we are able to tell, the census of 1871 being taken as the authority, the value of the boots and shoes consumed in Canada in 1870 was $16,133,688. Now, sir, in 1876-7 there were imported into Canada altogether of boots and shoes of every kind only $302,671 worth, or less than the fiftieth part of the total manufacture of the country. But then we actually exported from the country that year $196,710 worth of boots and shoes, leaving a difference of only $105,961 between our imports and exports of that article. Now, how much is this, do you think, among the entire population of the country? It is the merest possible fraction. Then we will take the article of household furniture—and I feel particularly interested in that item in the city of Toronto, because a well-known old friend of mine, a manufacturer of furniture, is now in the field as a political candidate, and I am sure that Mr. Hay will give me credit for sincerity when I state that I would be sorry to say one word that would jar upon his feelings in speaking of any matter affecting the political position of himself or his friends. But, sir, we find that the entire product of the country in the year 1870—and it has very much increased since—is put at something over $3,500,000 in furniture; and the entire imports for furniture for last year amounted to $238,989, while we exported $143,506 worth, leaving a total difference between our exports of furniture and our imports of $140,334—or as near as possible 3½ cents per head. (Hear, hear.) And yet, sir, Mr. Hay assumes that we are ruining his business because we don't give him more than 17½ per cent. of protection. For every dollar's worth of goods that he manufactures the country pays him 17½ cents premium, and yet he wants more, although the entire consumption of the country is almost wholly manufactured in Canada. Let us consider other branches—the stove trade for instance. Any of you who know who the stove makers of Canada are, any of you who wish to visit the vast establishments of Mr. Gurney and other manufacturers, will be slow to believe that these are pursuing a very ruinous trade. I recollect that in 1874, when the tariff was revised, having repeated interviews with many of those manufacturers. They wanted a higher duty to save themselves the trouble of applying their brains to find out the means of improving the machinery for the carrying on of their manufactories, as they wished for protection to enable them to send out what would be an inferior article at an increased cost to the people. Now I say that the position of Mr. Hay and Mr. Gurney, and, generally speaking, of the manufacturers of the country is not one of isolation from profit. When I find that men who commenced life much less than half a century ago now count their gains and their properties by hundreds of thousands, I am slow to believe that the business that they have been following is a ruinous one. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) With regard to the manufacture of boots and shoes, I have the word of some of the manufacturers of those articles that they do not want any more protection. (Voice—"Not a bit.") I am perfectly aware that some large manufacturers of those articles have within the last few years failed in business, but they did not fail because their proper business was not paying. If the manufacturer invests in real estate when it is at $1 a foot, and has to sell it afterwards at 50 or 60 cents a foot, and fails in his boot and shoe trade in consequence, his failure is not to be attributed to the difficulties surrounding his manufacturing trade, but to neglecting his own line of business to follow one that he knows nothing about. I am speaking, sir, with the knowledge of individuals; I know the facts, and I could put my fingers upon the names of gentlemen whose experiences I have just indicated. There is not at this moment a boot and shoe maker who will be able to show to this country—it is impossible to show it—that he is not well paid for his capital. It cannot be otherwise, because out of the entire consumption of the country in boots and shoes we don't import more than one fifty-third or one fifty-fourth part, and that shows that they are able to derive profit from their business. I do not at all mean to say that it would not be possible to enact laws to make us pay more for our boots and shoes than we are paying now, and to make the manufacturers of boots and shoes better off; that could easily be done, but it would merely benefit the manufacturer, being at the same time a heavy tax upon all the rest of the people, though ultimately sure to result in injury to the manufacturers.

Cotton Goods and the Tariff.

Take another illustration. You have heard of the ruinous effects of a protective policy upon the cotton mills of the United States. In 1873-5, the first year of the existing tariff, the entire importation of bleached and unbleached cottons into Canada was $2,753,175; during the last financial year the entire importation of the same class of goods was $1,308,391. Now, I happen to know that manufacturers of cotton are able to make a fair profit—a better profit than manufacturers of many other kinds of goods in this country at the present moment. Here is a proof of it:—Our wholesale dealers have been able to purchase in the home market cheaper than they could import and pay seventeen and a half cents per dollar duty in addition. This shows that these manufacturers have a fair degree of prosperity. It may be quite true that it would be desirable to see them and all other classes in the country make a better profit than they have been able to do, but so long as they reap a reasonable profit in times of general trade depression it cannot be fair grounds of complaint. Now, the entire importation of cotton goods in 1873-5 was a shade under $10,000,000, while the entire importation in 1877 was only a shade over $7,750,000, or a decrease of nearly $2,500,000. In most cases when manufacturers of cotton or woollen goods have gone under it is because they had not conducted their business properly, because there has been an attempt made by some of the manufacturers to run on several lines of goods at the same time instead of giving their attention to one. We know that many manufacturers who have failed in the country have made blunders both as to their motive power and location of their works, and in many other respects which we have not time to consider, blunders which successful manufacturers escape; but we cannot see because people have been unsuccessful in creating or locating their manufactories, or in conducting them properly, that the country is bound to pay for their want of skill. (A voice—"What proportion of cotton came from the United States?") I cannot exactly tell where it was imported from, but that is no consequence. There is one class of cotton goods imported from England, another from the United States, and another class is manufactured chiefly in Canada. You will find that foreign manufacturers of cotton goods produce a kind of article which it would not pay our own people to make, because they would have to spend the same amount of labour on an inferior class of goods that they now expend on superior goods. Thereby give the results of the trade in vindication of the position I have taken—that the tariff we have is a very reasonable tariff for all manufactures, and a very burdensome one in the prices which it involves to all consumers. It cannot be denied that if the consumers of this country pay 17½ cents for every dollar's worth they purchase they pay very dear indeed for the protection of the manufacturer of every single class of goods in this country. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, I may say that if the United States is to be taken as a fair example of a country having a protective system and it must be, for it is the only English-speaking country in the world—the only country, I may say, of any kind which has deliberately adopted as a matter of principle a protective tariff the result is the destruction of their manufactures, the closing of their mills, indeed the failure of many of their manufacturers.

Comparative List of Failures.

But it is said, "Look at the number of failures in Canada." Canada must, no doubt, suffer in common with all countries at a time when trade is severely depressed over the whole world; but during the first quarter of the present year the failures in the United States were $84,000,000, as against $33,000,000 in 1873; while we had of failures during the last three months nine millions against seven and a half millions in 1873—showing the proportion of failures in the United States was at least as large as the proportion of failures in Canada. Now it is stated on the other hand that the United States manufacturers are, to a great extent, dependent upon foreign capital, and that their failures are caused by a lack of capital in the country. This is a great mistake and is shown to be a mistake by this fact—that you can get money in New York at the present time upon good security at three to five per cent., and we know that the United States have with in the last nine months sold to their own citizens nearly one hundred millions of bonds which only yield an interest of four per cent. The fact is that the utter failure of the manufactures of the country to pay dividends to the stockholders has induced the capitalists of that country to withhold the abundant capital which they possess from investment in that way; and they are investing it in any way which will bring to them a reasonable amount of interest.

Imports and Exports of Canada.

Now, sir, let us look at the total imports and exports of different classes of goods into this country. Taking the products of the mine, we had in 1877 a total importation of $4,287,060 and an importation of $3,688,958. Of the importation of products of the mine the chief item—the item which comprises almost the whole amount was coal. The importation was 972,022 tons, with a valuation of $3,650,000. Now, I would like to know from my friend Mr. Hay if he is favorable to a tax upon coal—(hear, hear)—if he believes, or if any one believes, if a tax upon the coal which we use to light our household fires, to keep our manufactories going, and run our railways and steamers, is likely to benefit the industries of this country? ("No, no.") In addition to this, it is known that coal is a prime necessity of our great railways, thereby facilitating and cheapening the transport of the productions of the country from the interior to the seaboard, and it would, therefore, in this case, be one of the most serious mistakes that could be made to tax this mineral product. No, sir, it is not contended that it would benefit the country, and no Ministry that ever lives will dare to impose a tax upon one of the first necessities of life. (Great cheering.) Another principal item is that of salt. Of that article we imported last year three millions of bushels. Now we have vast deposits of salt in Canada, and it would no doubt be beneficial to the Ontario salt producers to prohibit the importation of salt, which comes to the Maratime Provinces almost entirely from England. But, on the other hand, to do this would be to deprive our fishermen of the means of cheaply preserving the product of their industry; and when I say that our exports of fish last year amounted to $5,874,000 you will see that to impose such a duty as would prevent the import of salt would only be ruining one interest by promoting another interest. Of products of the forest there were imported into Canada last year $1,329,000 worth, and we exported to the amount of $23,965,000. Does any one believe—can any one in his senses believe—that we could raise the price of lumber to the lumber dealer by imposing a duty upon an article that we practically do not import at all? The thing would be impossible. Then let us take animals and their produce.

Absurdity of the Demand for Protection to Farmers.

Of animals and their produce we imported last year to the amount altogether of about six millions and a half in round numbers, while we exported fifteen and a half millions, showing that we were able to export two and a half times the amount we imported, and showing also that almost our whole imports of animals and their products were merely brought into the country for the sake of re-exportation at the other end of the country; and do you see how ludicrous is the proposal to put a protective duty on animals and their products, I have but to mention that while there were exported 120,572 sheep last year from Ontario to the United States, we only imported seven sheep altogether from that country. (Laughter.) And yet the protectionists want to tax these seven sheep to a great extent as the American sheep not only hundred and fifty and odd thousands. (Laughter.) This is the way they propose we should enrich ourselves. Of agricultural products, that is, grain and breadstuffs generally, we imported last year—and everyone will remember that was a very bad year, that it was one of the worst years we ever had—seven million and a half in round numbers of dollars worth. But then we exported of them, even in that bad year, nineteen millions and a quarter of dollars worth in round numbers, showing that it would be impossible by any law to give the farmer a larger price for his produce than he now receives. Let us assume for a moment that by taxing foreign grain or flour we could keep it out of this country, is it possible that the workingmen of Toronto would ask us to tax the bread they eat. (A voice, no.) Yet, sir, that is exactly what the leaders of the Conservative party are asking us to do. They say that if our tax takes effect would raise the price to the miller, but if it did raise the price it would be done at the expense of the poor man who has to purchase it. (Hear, hear.) Sir John Macdonald in his speech in the Eastern townships that if we happened to have a deficient harvest our producers should reap the advantage of prices coming in from abroad by reason of a duty on foreign importations. That is, our buyers of bread should be compelled to pay high prices, or else. Let us shut out these foreign potatoes and peas which are coming in, and pay seventeen and a half cents per dollar duty in addition. This shows that these manufacturers have a fair degree of prosperity. It may be quite true that it would be desirable to see them and all other classes in the country make a better profit than they have been able to do, but so long as they reap a reasonable profit in times of general trade depression it cannot be fair grounds of complaint. Now, the entire importation of cotton goods in 1873-5 was a shade under $10,000,000, while the entire importation in 1877 was only a shade over $7,750,000, or a decrease of nearly $2,500,000. In most cases when manufacturers of cotton or woollen goods have gone under it is because they had not conducted their business properly, because there has been an attempt made by some of the manufacturers to run on several lines of goods at the same time instead of giving their attention to one. We know that many manufacturers who have failed in the country have made blunders both as to their motive power and location of their works, and in many other respects which we have not time to consider, blunders which successful manufacturers escape; but we cannot see because people have been unsuccessful in creating or locating their manufactories, or in conducting them properly, that the country is bound to pay for their want of skill. (A voice—"What proportion of cotton came from the United States?") I cannot exactly tell where it was imported from, but that is no consequence. There is one class of cotton goods imported from England, another from the United States, and another class is manufactured chiefly in Canada. You will find that foreign manufacturers of cotton goods produce a kind of article which it would not pay our own people to make, because they would have to spend the same amount of labour on an inferior class of goods that they now expend on superior goods. Thereby give the results of the trade in vindication of the position I have taken—that the tariff we have is a very reasonable tariff for all manufactures, and a very burdensome one in the prices which it involves to all consumers. It cannot be denied that if the consumers of this country pay 17½ cents for every dollar's worth they purchase they pay very dear indeed for the protection of the manufacturer of every single class of goods in this country. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, I may say that if the United States is to be taken as a fair example of a country having a protective system and it must be, for it is the only English-speaking country in the world—the only country, I may say, of any kind which has deliberately adopted as a matter of principle a protective tariff the result is the destruction of their manufactures, the closing of their mills, indeed the failure of many of their manufacturers.

Comparative List of Failures.

But it is said, "Look at the number of failures in Canada." Canada must, no doubt, suffer in common with all countries at a time when trade is severely depressed over the whole world; but during the first quarter of the present year the failures in the United States were $84,000,000, as against $33,000,000 in 1873; while we had of failures during the last three months nine millions against seven and a half millions in 1873—showing the proportion of failures in the United States was at least as large as the proportion of failures in Canada. Now it is stated on the other hand that the United States manufacturers are, to a great extent, dependent upon foreign capital, and that their failures are caused by a lack of capital in the country. This is a great mistake and is shown to be a mistake by this fact—that you can get money in New York at the present time upon good security at three to five per cent., and we know that the United States have with in the last nine months sold to their own citizens nearly one hundred millions of bonds which only yield an interest of four per cent. The fact is that the utter failure of the manufactures of the country to pay dividends to the stockholders has induced the capitalists of that country to withhold the abundant capital which they possess from investment in that way; and they are investing it in any way which will bring to them a reasonable amount of interest.

Imports and Exports of Canada.

Now, sir, let us look at the total imports and exports of different classes of goods into this country. Taking the products of the mine, we had in 1877 a total importation of $4,287,060 and an importation of $3,688,958. Of the importation of products of the mine the chief item—the item which comprises almost the whole amount was coal. The importation was 972,022 tons, with a valuation of $3,650,000. Now, I would like to know from my friend Mr. Hay if he is favorable to a tax upon coal—(hear, hear)—if he believes, or if any one believes, if a tax upon the coal which we use to light our household fires, to keep our manufactories going, and run our railways and steamers, is likely to benefit the industries of this country? ("No, no.") In addition to this, it is known that coal is a prime necessity of our great railways, thereby facilitating and cheapening the transport of the productions of the country from the interior to the seaboard, and it would, therefore, in this case, be one of the most serious mistakes that could be made to tax this mineral product. No, sir, it is not contended that it would benefit the country, and no Ministry that ever lives will dare to impose a tax upon one of the first necessities of life. (Great cheering.) Another principal item is that of salt. Of that article we imported last year three millions of bushels. Now we have vast deposits of salt in Canada, and it would no doubt be beneficial to the Ontario salt producers to prohibit the importation of salt, which comes to the Maratime Provinces almost entirely from England. But, on the other hand, to do this would be to deprive our fishermen of the means of cheaply preserving the product of their industry; and when I say that our exports of fish last year amounted to $5,874,000 you will see that to impose such a duty as would prevent the import of salt would only be ruining one interest by promoting another interest. Of products of the forest there were imported into Canada last year $1,329,000 worth, and we exported to the amount of $23,965,000. Does any one believe—can any one in his senses believe—that we could raise the price of lumber to the lumber dealer by imposing a duty upon an article that we practically do not import at all? The thing would be impossible. Then let us take animals and their produce.

Absurdity of the Demand for Protection to Farmers.

Of animals and their produce we imported last year to the amount altogether of about six millions and a half in round numbers, while we exported fifteen and a half millions, showing that we were able to export two and a half times the amount we imported, and showing also that almost our whole imports of animals and their products were merely brought into the country for the sake of re-exportation at the other end of the country; and do you see how ludicrous is the proposal to put a protective duty on animals and their products, I have but to mention that while there were exported 120,572 sheep last year from Ontario to the United States, we only imported seven sheep altogether from that country. (Laughter.) And yet the protectionists want to tax these seven sheep to as great an extent as the American sheep not only hundred and fifty and odd thousands. (Laughter.) This is the way they propose we should enrich ourselves. Of agricultural products, that is, grain and breadstuffs generally, we imported last year—and everyone will remember that was a very bad year, that it was one of the worst years we ever had—seven million and a half in round numbers of dollars worth. But then we exported of them, even in that bad year, nineteen millions and a quarter of dollars worth in round numbers, showing that it would be impossible by any law to give the farmer a larger price for his produce than he now receives. Let us assume for a moment that by taxing foreign grain or flour we could keep it out of this country, is it possible that the workingmen of Toronto would ask us to tax the bread they eat. (A voice, no.) Yet, sir, that is exactly what the leaders of the Conservative party are asking us to do. They say that if our tax takes effect would raise the price to the miller, but if it did raise the price it would be done at the expense of the poor man who has to purchase it. (Hear, hear.) Sir John Macdonald in his speech in the Eastern townships that if we happened to have a deficient harvest our producers should reap the advantage of prices coming in from abroad by reason of a duty on foreign importations. That is, our buyers of bread should be compelled to pay high prices, or else. Let us shut out these foreign potatoes and peas which are coming in, and pay seventeen and a half cents per dollar duty in addition. This shows that these manufacturers have a fair degree of prosperity. It may be quite true that it would be desirable to see them and all other classes in the country make a better profit than they have been able to do, but so long as they reap a reasonable profit in times of general trade depression it cannot be fair grounds of complaint. Now, the entire importation of cotton goods in 1873-5 was a shade under $10,000,000, while the entire importation in 1877 was only a shade over $7,750,000, or a decrease of nearly $2,500,000. In most cases when manufacturers of cotton or woollen goods have gone under it is because they had not conducted their business properly, because there has been an attempt made by some of the manufacturers to run on several lines of goods at the same time instead of giving their attention to one. We know that many manufacturers who have failed in the country have made blunders both as to their motive power and location of their works, and in many other respects which we have not time to consider, blunders which successful manufacturers escape; but we cannot see because people have been unsuccessful in creating or locating their manufactories, or in conducting them properly, that the country is bound to pay for their want of skill. (A voice—"What proportion of cotton came from the United States?") I cannot exactly tell where it was imported from, but that is no consequence. There is one class of cotton goods imported from England, another from the United States, and another class is manufactured chiefly in Canada. You will find that foreign manufacturers of cotton goods produce a kind of article which it would not pay our own people to make, because they would have to spend the same amount of labour on an inferior class of goods that they now expend on superior goods. Thereby give the results of the trade in vindication of the position I have taken—that the tariff we have is a very reasonable tariff for all manufactures, and a very burdensome one in the prices which it involves to all consumers. It cannot be denied that if the consumers of this country pay 17½ cents for every dollar's worth they purchase they pay very dear indeed for the protection of the manufacturer of every single class of goods in this country. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, I may say that if the United States is to be taken as a fair example of a country having a protective system and it must be, for it is the only English-speaking country in the world—the only country, I may say, of any kind which has deliberately adopted as a matter of principle a protective tariff the result is the destruction of their manufactures, the closing of their mills, indeed the failure of many of their manufacturers.

Comparative List of Failures.

But it is said, "Look at the number of failures in Canada." Canada must, no doubt, suffer in common with all countries at a time when trade is severely depressed over the whole world; but during the first quarter of the present year the failures in the United States were $84,000,000, as against $33,000,000 in 1873; while we had of failures during the last three months nine millions against seven and a half millions in 1873—showing the proportion of failures in the United States was at least as large as the proportion of failures in Canada. Now it is stated on the other hand that the United States manufacturers are, to a great extent, dependent upon foreign capital, and that their failures are caused by a lack of capital in the country. This is a great mistake and is shown to be a mistake by this fact—that you can get money in New York at the present time upon good security at three to five per cent., and we know that the United States have with in the last nine months sold to their own citizens nearly one hundred millions of bonds which only yield an interest of four per cent. The fact is that the utter failure of the manufactures of the country to pay dividends to the stockholders has induced the capitalists of that country to withhold the abundant capital which they possess from investment in that way; and they are investing it in any way which will bring to them a reasonable amount of interest.

Imports and Exports of Canada.

Now, sir, let us look at the total imports and exports of different classes of goods into this country. Taking the products of the mine, we had in 1877 a total importation of $4,287,060 and an importation of $3,688,958. Of the importation of products of the mine the chief item—the item which comprises almost the whole amount was coal. The importation was 972,022 tons, with a valuation of $3,650,000. Now, I would like to know from my friend Mr. Hay if he is favorable to a tax upon coal—(hear, hear)—if he believes, or if any one believes, if a tax upon the coal which we use to light our household fires, to keep our manufactories going, and run our railways and steamers, is likely to benefit the industries of this country? ("No, no.") In addition to this, it is known that coal is a prime necessity of our great railways, thereby