amount of \$1,421,000. That was held when the wooden ships of Canada up to us as one of the first apparent again take their fruits of the National Policy. We No better ships are employed were led to suppose that unless our exports exceeded our imports this country could not be prosperous, and to believe that in future, the hon. Finance Minister, in bringing down his budgets. would be able to congratulate the counyear the hon, gentleman was silent on and lumbering interests. to enlighten us I examined the returns and find that our imports exceeded our the theory of the hon. Finance Minister where must we be going to now? Are we again on the road to ruin? And Canada's exports will exceed her im- or only 27 per cent. Now, when increased \$19,000,000.

THE "FAIR TRADE" BUBBLE. A good deal was said by hon. gentle. men opposite last year about England adopting a policy of Protection. I have no fear on that point. The advocates of that policy found the word "Protecand used instead the term "Fair trade. What do we hear of fair trade to-day Why, Sir, the cry is silenced, and while I maintain that it never had any hold on any considerable portion of the people of England, I claim that such a thing hardly exists at present. England does not want any fairer trade than she has got, or any protective policy. Her exports increased last year and her im-Free Trade.

THE SECRET OF NATIONAL PROSPERITY. We find England prospering beyond anything that we in Canada are enjoying, and it is well for us to look into the facts, in discussing this subject of national prosperity, and learn the reason why any nation prospers. A large portion of the prosperity of England to-day is derived from her shipyards and carrying trade. Not more of England filled with steam tonnage unemployed, and was informed by persons generally well informed on such subjects, by cautious, shrewd, business men, that there was more steam tonnage in the country than the world could employ, and that England had so largely overbuilt that they feared the consequences would be serious. What do we find to-day? We see trade so increased and flourishing that every one of those vessels is not only employed, but profitably employed, and the shipyards of England are full to their utmost capacity, with orders sufficient to keep them employed for the next two years. What a contrast with the condition of Canada! While English shipbuilders have orders ahead for two years, the ship-yards of Canada are

MARITIME INTERESTS NEGLECTED AND INJURED. We maintain that our friends on the Government side have neglected this trade-that they have not built it up or attempted to do so. The hon. Finance Minister-representing a maritime city, who should take an interest in everything pertaining to that porthas not only not done anything to foster this industry, but has done all in his power to injure it. We find him telling us that he cannot do anything to assist this or the lumber trade, the latter a business the export of which amounts to 73 per cent. of the total exports of his native Province; yet he has repressed that industry by putting a tax on materials that go into the production of lumber, and has done nothing to assist it. Is it possible that 73 per cent. of the exports of his own Province are to bear such burdens -and what sustain the factories in Ontario and western Quebec. Why should we be thus oppressed? I heard the hon. gentleman himself call this timber trade a waning industry. If is waning, so much the more reason why it should be assisted. The hongentleman contended that under his policy good would be done to all the working classes; to every person the Dominion, including the toilers of New Brunswick. He spoke that way in New Brunswick, but did not pretend to have such anxiety about the interests of Ontario and other Provinces. His speech did not savor so strongly of the manufacturing interests of the western portion of the Dominion. His points were all made for the ear of New Brunswick, whose interests were to be greatly assisted by his policy. We now want some of those benefits that he THE N. P. FAVORS THE UNITED STATES AS promised us. We maintain we have got none of them so far, though largely injured by that policy.

OUR SHIPPING INTERESTS. I was a little struck, I will not say amused, on reading an article in ar Ottawa paper a day or two ago, on the subject of a meeting held in London in this policy was introduced. I think, it reference to an International Fishery Exhibition which is contemplated, and at which Sir A. T. Galt informed the Prince of Wales and others in England that Canada at present was too apt to take its direction of thought from the people of England and that Canada is following, at a distance, English public opinion. We, taking direction of thought and following at a distance, English public opinion! Well, I think we are following it at a very long distance-at all the distance between Free Trade and Protection-and that is as great a distance as you can get between any two points. He also remarked that in England's commerce is found the secret of her greatness. I maintain he was quite right there, and so in our commerce lay the greatness of Canada

in long ocean voyages, are in greater favor in Britain, for certain purposes, and the time will come when our friends on this side of the House will take their seats on the other side, and we shall see how

try annually on similar results. This much they can do, both for the shipping this matter : and as he did not choose OUR SHARE OF GREAT BRITAIN AND EUROPE'S LUMBER SUPPLY. Some persons, discussing this subject. exports by over \$7,000,000. Now, if suppose that the lumber interest needs no protection-that we have be correct -- that unless our exports ex- | markets in our own hands-that Europe ceed our imports we are not prosperous, I must have our lumber, and at our own prices. I find from the official returns. authentic information which any hon. must the hon, gentleman put on the gentleman may examine, from statistics breaks again, and give us another printed by order of the British Parlia. National Policy? I am not, however, ment, that Great Britain consumed durso alarmed as the hon. gentleman was ing the last year, in round numbers, on this point, for I find that other \$70,000,000 worth of lumber. Where countries that have prospered, and did she get that lumber? Of the imcontinue to prosper, import more than ports into Great Britain, Capada prothey export. The time will come when duced something less than \$19,000,000, ports, and that will be when she will consider the value of some of our begin paying off her liabilities. While woods, our pine, oak, and other woods our imports increased so rapidly last exported, we can see what a very small year, the Mother Country, which, proportion of the shipping employed according to hon. gentlemen opposite, in the wood-carrying trade of England will go to ruin unless she adopts our is engaged in the carrying trade from policy, exhibits a return just the Canada. While England is only getting reverse. Great Britain imported last 27 per cent. of her lumber from Canyear \$80,000,000 worth of goods less ada, whence is she getting the rest?than the previous year, while we are on From Norway, Sweden and the north of the opposite track, our imports having Russia she obtained \$38,690,000 worth. or 55 per cent. of her imports. Is England then dependent upon us? We have comparatively little of the trade, and still less of the continental trade, and little or none of the African, Australian and other business. The trade of Norway and Sweden in lumber extends even to tion" was obnoxious to British ears. South America. When the whole trade is computed-I have not the figures on that point-I think you will find that, of the lumber trade to Europe, our contribution does not embrace 10 per cent. of the whole. I think it may be said that, as to the pine of Quebec and Ontario, the trade there have the price. to a large extent, in their own hands. by means of a limited production. In this way they may, to some extent, conports decreased under her policy of trol the markets of Europe in that article. But. Sir. when you come to the description of lumber, such as spruce and coarse woods, shipped from the Maritime Provinces, we have no control whatever. A large quantity of such woods comes from the north of Europe, and we have to take such prices as we can get in competition with them. They have every advantage over us .-We have the Atlantic ocean between us and our market, and have to pay from than three years ago I saw the docks | 60 to 70 shillings per standard freight whereas they send theirs in at from 10

> "N. P."-NATIONAL PAUPERISM. In dwelling upon the National Policy I am not prepared to say that there is no section of this country receiving benefit from it; but if there are sections they are very small ones, and they are not in the Maritime Provinces. What we claim is, that the whole country should not be compelled to suffer to such an extent for the benefit of such a small portion. It you are going to give back to every man just what you take from him, what benefit does he receive in the operation? But, if you are going to protect certain industries at the expense of the whole population, you make one section of the people support another section. It is just another system of pau perism. It is not encouraging people to rely upon their own resources, but you teach them to believe that all they have to do in time of adversity is to lean upon the Government.

£2 to £3 against us in the freight alone.

SIR LEONARD'S "IFS." Now, I find that the honorable

the Minister of Finance sometimes make extraordinary arguments. In looking over his speech, on the third page of the Hansard, I find he tells us what would be our position under certain circum. stances. He says "If the Mackenzie Government, during

heir term of office, had collected \$5,491. 000, or more than they did collect. would have amounted to \$1.38 per head. But the Mackenzie Government did not collect that amount, and the people have got the money." Sir Leonard Tilley-That is where the

Mr. Snowball-Exactly, they have got the money and the hon, the Finance Min ister does not want them to have it. He wants to wring money from the people whether they like it or not. Good timeor bad times, the hon, the Finance Minis ter seems determined to have the money. and the people have to suffer. The hon. gentleman not only tells us that, if the Mackenzie Government had done certain things how much extra they would have taxed the people, but he also tells us that if he (the Finance Minister) had not col lected a surplus of \$2.589,000 the people would not have paid 65 cents per head which they did, however, pay. He puts the two together-what they paid under him and what they did not pay under the Mackenzie Administration-and makes it equal to \$2.13 per head. Of course, if the Mackenzie Government had collected it. the people would have paid it, but that Government was too considerate to burden the people at that time; but the hon, the Minister of Finance was not so considerate, for he collected \$2,500,000 which was not required, and the people had to pay it. But this is just in accordance with the hon. Minister's usual mode of argument.

AGAINST GREAT BRITAIN. I will trouble the House while I read few further remarks of the hon.the Minis ter of Finance. I find on page 9 of the Hansard report of his speech, he says: " I desire to say a few words with reference to the predictions that were made on the opposite side of the House when my memory serves me, that every one of them have failed, and utterly failed." He goes on to say:-

"What were the statements that were made when this policy was introduced? One of them was that it was calculated to interfere with the trade between the Dominion of Canada and Great Britain, that the policy was one that was in the interest of the United States rather than of Great

Britain. "Time solves many questions, and it has solved that. I have in my hand a statement-I have selected the year 1877. because the imports for consumption are nearer, in that year, to that of 1881, than that of any other year I could find under the old Tariff -- from which I find that the gross imports for consumption in 1876-77

Well, sir, on this side of the House, we not failed. Then the hon gentleman goes Nova Scotia, like the people of every other the tugs.

tlemen on that side of the house objected they would sooner raise 1,000,000 tons to its being included, he deducts that, and then goes on to tell us that the imports from the United States during the year 1877 were 51 per cent, of the total imports, while the imports from England were only 43 per cent. Then further on he proceeds to show the superiority of their policy, what it had done for the country, that the imports from Great Britain in the past year were 48 per cent. while the imports from the United States were only 40 per cent. Now, there was a decrease under his policy in imports from the United States of 11 per cent., while the imports from England had increased 5 per cent. Now, what is the actual state of affairs? The hon, gentleman, with, as I said, apparent honesty, has taken out grain that was exported, but he has included the quantity that was consumed in this country. Certainly we imported at that time large quantities of grain from the United States. How the markets of the country were then I am not prepared to say, but no doubt much of what we im ported went into the Lower Provinces. Does that argument show anything at all as to whether this National Policy is work. ing for or against the United States, or for or against England? I maintain it does not. Where do the Americans buy their own supply? Looking at the trade and Navigation Returns published under the authority of the Parliament of Great Britain, I find that the United States were compelled during the last year to import former years. I believe that the prosperi ty of that country has been great, and no doubt that prosperity has been caused by the National Policy in Canada! No doubt the hon. Minister of Finance must take credit for it, because, if there be prosperi ty anywhere it must be his doing. I pro cured the Board of Trade Returns fo Great Britain for 1880, but unfortunately I was not able to procure the annual re turns for 1881, except monthly issues, and I have not had time to recapitulate them. I find in those returns that the exports om Great Britain for January of th year were \$12,500,000 more than they were in the corresponding month of last year but I am unable to say what portion o them went to the United States. It show that the people of the United States have s large a consuming capacity that they have to import goods from other countries. W also find the corn crop in the United States being an utter failure last year. They have not been able to supply us with corn for feeding purposes in this country, an consequently our imports from them hav not been so great, and, of course, the N P. is given credit therefor. In 1877, th very year the hon. gentleman takes for his comparison with the year 1881, the United States imported from England \$81,884,000 worth of manufactured goods. In 1880, the last year I have returns for, she im ported \$154,000,000, or nearly double. the United States has to import goods fo herself, how is she to sell them to us? Are the people of this country so lost to their own interests that they go to the United States to buy goods which the latter imto 30 shillings, so there is at once from port, instead of going to Europe, where we send our exports, and bringing back the goods we want in return? Is it not a natural thing that we should buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest If the hon, gentleman had been honest h would have told us that the cheapest mar ket for us at the present time is Europe. fact which our merchants themselves know for they went there and bought their goods; and consequently our imports from the United States fell off, because the latter had not the goods to sell us, but had Great Britain.

to supply themselves from the markets of HOW THE MARITIME PROVINCES SUFFER. He goes on to say that one objection raised to the Tariff on this side of the House was that it would increase the taxation to certain of the smaller Provinces; he asserted that we paid 141 cents per head more than was collected from the people of Ontario and Quebec in the five years of the Mackenzie Administration-a small proportion certainly-while for the last two years we have paid less. He says, further, that the Tariff has had a beneficial effect on the smaller Provinces, especially Prince Edward Island. will be found, he says, that if any person, or locality, or section had to complain, it is not the smaler Provinces that were arraigned here, and on behalf of whom the sympathies of the House were nvoked, for the practical effect had been reduction rather than an increase of heir taxation. I find on page 11 of the Frade and Navigation Returns, the relative bearing of the Customs Tariff on the different Provinces of the Dominion, and the following are the results: The percentage of duty on total imports, including fall goods, for the Province of Quebec, in 1881, was 15.79; Outario, 18.27; Prince Edward Island, the Province that the hon. zentleman referred to, 26.58; Nova Scotia, 18 35; New Brunswick, 21.25; Manitona. 22.60; British Columbia, 24.08. Prince Edward Island stands highest of all, while the hon. Minister assured us she paid least, and their own returns show that all the smaller Provinces pay in excess of the

THE COAL MONOPOLY. The hon. Minister also referred at some length to the coal tax. We were informed that there were 400,000 tons more of coal raised in the Dominion last year than in the previous year, which, the hon, gentleman claimed effected a certain amount of benefit. If we deduct the amount raised in British Columbia, this sum will stand it something like 350,000 tons. I may also refer to the remarks of the hon, member for Pictou, Mr. Doull, while on this subject. Among the many statements he made was one to the effect that the coal forming rings for the purpose of forcing the people to buy at their own prices, and he said that when the rings broke the consumers got the benefit. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is well for us to know that under his policy we are liable to be preyed upon he refers. The hon, gentleman also told us that the coal owners of Nova Scotia lid not raise enough coal; that they did not exert themselves. This is exactly that it teaches the people to lean on the Government instead of exerting themselves. The hon, gentleman asserted that been increased, but I would like him to explain what the National Policy has to lo with that fact. Certainly, there must be plenty of room there yet for extension, as only 15,000 tons went there last year. He said, also, that they could have sold more coal, but it took them a great leal of their time to supply the home market. This is all very well, but I say that these facts-especially as it is claimed that they could send their coal as far up the say just the same things still, that our | St. Lawrence as Montreal at least, and had predictions have not failed, and I will go plenty of freights in the early part of the have to use imported coal, and the charge

exceeded our imports to the gratifying greatness, for I hope to see the day ported from this sum, because hon. gen get a clear profit of 50 cents per ton, and people of Nova Scotia? Hon. gentlemen centage and the figures are there to verify of putting it than to admit squarely that having lived in the coal district for the with a profit of 50 cents per ton than 5.000,000 with a profit of 10 cents per ton. Let us look at the exports of coal from England, as shown in the parliamentary returns. The exports of coal from Great Britain increased last year, although the price did not increase one cent-in fact. was rather lower than before. In other required. The number of tug-boats on words, unprotected England exported millions of tons more coal last year than the year lefore, and yet she did not harge any additional price, while you the trade open than an advance of 10 cents per ton at once took place, followed this year with a further advance of 25 | coal. The people in their households also cents. We were told that at the time this policy was being introduced that all Nova Scotia wanted was an increased market-and that she did not want extra the people would have got their coal price. They wanted a larger field; they cheaper. What are the people of Nova got a larger field; and they no sooner got | Scotia paying for that tax? I take up the to people to whom the cost is not so much | wages that they ought to pay, and are it than they advanced the price of their | Trade and Navigation Returns, and find coal 10 cents a ton. When I was in Eng. | that they paid \$44,000 duty on cornmeal. land, I received a circular issued by coal What for? Was it not in compensation owners of Nova Scotia, stating that there | for the duty placed on coal? Who has would be a further advance of 25 cents from the 1st of January last, and there saving: "You had Letter buy your goal | er must be getting the benefit. The poor in Europe." These gentlemen do not people have been called on to pay \$44,000 want the trade; what they want is a big duty ou cornmeal alone to maintain the profit. If the duty was not on, they stead of increasing their production. which the hon, member for Pictou tells us \$9,000 duty on flour, \$15,000 on Indian they are not doing to the extent to which they should, they are advancing the price to he consumer. They have not only the dvantage of the duty, but they have pecial advantages in the way of freight rom the Intercolonial Railway, and still | Province? They are paying a still fursqueeze the miners in their employ. should warn these people at once that the soal owners are getting larger advanced prices, and that they are entitled to a portion of the profits.

PICTOU vs. ENGLISH COAL. crossing the Atlantic years ago in company he hon, member for Picton, a con ersation arose at the table in reference to oals, in consequence of the steamer mak ng poor time. We were told that the ause of delay was bad coal, and that it ook about one day longer to make a voyige from America to Europe when Picton oals were used than it did when using English coals. The hon, member for Pictou naturally became a little irritated because these coals were not appreciated. There are good coals in Nova Scotia, but I am sorry to say there are not many in he Pictou mines. In the course of this conversation, some person asked the hon. gentleman why he did not go to Parliament und raise his voice in favor of getting a luty placed on coal. He said : "I am going to Parliament at the next election, and I will raise my voice to have an import duty." Then I was asked what I would do, and I said : "I will go to Parliament too, and vote against him." And true enough, after the election, my hon. friend was here voting for a duty on coal. and I was here trying to cancel his vote. showing that much said in jest may prove true. Notwithstanding the heavy duty. we find that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the imports of coal are steadily ncreasing year by year, and the consumers have to pay the duty; so that I main ain that the coal duty affects the people of the Maritime Provinces injuriously, as well as the people of Ontario.

Mr. Doull .- Will the hon, gentleman allow me one word of explanation? He has attempted to disparage the quality of our Nova Scotia coal. I can inform him and the House that a test will prove that the quality of our coal is equal to the quality of any coal in the United States

with the exception of one. Mr. Snowball .- I am very happy to allow the hon, gentleman to say anything he can on behalf of Nova Scotia coal but I know you can always get a very good analysis for coal as well as for other things. There is one mine in Pictou which produces fair coal.

Mr. Kirkpatrick .- I may state that the Ontario Government made comparative tests of Nova Scotia coal and American coal, and they reported to a large manu facturing establishment with which I am connected that 180 lbs. of American coal is equal to 160 lbs. of Nova Scotia coal. Mr. Mackenzie. - When was this report

Mr. Kirkpatrick. - Last autumn. Sir Richard J. Cartwright .- Perhaps the hon, gentleman will state the descrip-Mr. Kirkpatrick .- Coal for steam pur

the hon, gentleman states. I have not made any reference to United States coal, but I have no doubt that, if the gentleman who made this analysis wished, he might have found American coal that would go as far and probably much further ahead of Nova Scotia coal. He seems not to know any thing about Nova Scotia coal, because there are mines in Pictou so close together that in one you can hear the click of the hammer in the other, and yet there is no comparison between the quality of the coal in the two mines. I know it is when supplied with Picton coal. he knows it perfectly well.

that to the hon, member for Pictou, and Mr. Doull. I do not : it is not correct. Mr. Snowball. That was the case as went to sea. I am quite willing to stand up for the coal produced in that Province. if I can do so; but it is no use trying to force it on the public, because consumers ascertain very soon whether it is suitable both as regards steam vessels and dwelling houses, what is requisite is a coal of which the smallest quantity will produce the largest amount of heat. That is not found in the section of Nova Scotia which the hon, gentleman represents. Spring by the formation of these rings to which | hill coal will produce the heat and it is a splendid coal for steam purposes, but it is very expensive; it goes off like a flash and if you have not to keep taking ashes out as with Pictou coals, you have to keep analysis; but when you come down to actual consumption it will be found that the export of coal to the West Indies had of the tug-boats owned in New Brunswick many of them use Pictou coal.

Mr. Doull. I ask again permission to make an explanation. On the contrary. Pictou coal is preferable for steam purposes to the coal he mentions. Mr. Snowball. We do not build tugbeats with capacity to carry a coal mine,

but we construct them to carry a small on to show, bye-and-bye, how they have season-only proves that the people of has to be paid by the people employing

than in the previous year. They would have raised that quantity under any circumstance. The consumption of the country has more than increased in that proportion. With the ordinary prosperity of the country that quantity would be our rivers is increasing very rapidly, and as our lumber gets exhausted, and business becomes more scattered, it is necessary to bring the different points together, and this can only be done by steam power which requires coal, Our railways and steamboats are constantly requiring more consume more coal, and the natural increase would have been more than 350,000 tons, provided we had no coal tax, -and gained any benefit from the duty? The miners of Pictou are not receiving any higher wages, and therefore the coal owncoal monopoly in Nova Scotia. I find that, although the Intercolonial Railway passes right through the whole of that Province in one direction, the people paid corn: that Nova Scotia paid on Indian corn, flour and wheat, last year, \$73,375 into the Treasury to maintain this monopoly. Are 350,000 additional tons of coal worth \$73,000 to the people of that ther additional charge on flour because it enables the Intercolonial and other railways to charge additional freight to the people consuming it. On buying flour last fall-and this is a circumstance that happened to myself-I complained to the parties in Toronto that the freight charged was excessive, and I asked for an explanation. They wrote that they would deliver flour in Liverpool, England, 10 cents ower than at Miramichi. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that I was not paying a charge on that flour equal to the luty of 50 cents per barrel when I was

paying 10 cents per barrel more than it could be delivered in Liverpool for? The people of the West when they have a surplus must sell their flour in Europe; they have to compete with American flour in the market and must accept current prices. But, the railway companies know there s no other means to get flour to certain ov railway, and they place the freight so s to put 50 cents in their coffers from the ockets of the consumers, and the farmers lerive no benefit, but the country suffers. This is the effect of monopolies in trade. The country is suffering, but this is not half what the people of Nova Scotia pay ndirectly. The section of the country that comes within the railway system, pays a tax of \$75,000 on bread stuffs alone making with the duty before referred to about \$150,000-to maintain what? To maintain a duty of 50 cents a ton on coal to enable them to raise 350,000 tons extra. If there is anything in the protective sys em, these people, the bread consumers t is who have a right to protection against these charges. I am not tighting against the coal duties so strongly

whole country is made to suffer. SUGAR-FINANCE vs. CUSTOMS.

tem. The principle is one by which the

The next subject Jealt with by the hon the Finance Minister was that of sugar. do not intend to make any special reference to sugar, as it has been fully exposed already by the hon. member for St. John Mr. Burpee, but I find that the hon. the Finance Minister, in regard to sugar duties, said

"Still, I admit that, as regards refined and granulated sugars, there was the difference 25 cents. I have a carefully prepared eturn showing the value during two periods in each year in New York and Montreal, deducting the drawback and dding 30 cents per cwt. as the expense importation, because the calculation made up shows 50 cents per cwt. prefit on | tion, Messrs. Cantlie, Ewan & Co., Monransactions between the New York rener and the Conadian consumers; giving e consumers the benefit of that, there as 7 eents less charged to the people of lanada on that line of sugars than if it had been imported from New York under the old Tariff."

That was to say, that the people of Canada were paying 7 cents per 100 lbs. less for sugar than they did under the late Tariff. What do I find? I find, in examining those returns (because in the few remarks I am about to make, I am going to bring the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Customs into irect antagonism) that the hon. Minister f Finance made a Budget Speech, and the other Minister made a report for the enefit of the country. As the latter gentleman's report has a blue cover. admit, I put more confidence in it than ! to in the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister, Of sugars above 14 Dutch standard there were, the Minister of Cus toms informs us, 70,000,000 lbs. imported into Canada last year which paid as aggregate duty of \$1,459,000. I find the first item in these sugar returns is 15,858. 000 lbs. costing \$756, 186 or \$4.76 per 100 bs. and paying duty of \$423,265 or \$2.66 per 100 lbs. Yet the hon. Minister of Finance contends that the consumers ob tained their sugar cheaper than if that duty had been removed. How does the hon, gentleman reconcile the two statements? He tells us that by the imposi tion of that tax, we get the staple 7 cents per 100 lbs cheaper. Will this statement bear investigation at all? If our manufacturers could manufacture the sugar and sell it cheaper than if imported, why did they not do so? Did the importers not understand their trade, and did the consumers not know what they were doing when we find over half the sugar consumed in the Dominion last year was refined when imported, and paid a duty of over two cents per lb? The hon. Minister said:

"I trust I may be able to use as strong anguage, or language very similar t that employed by my hon, friend from South Brant, that the result of the in crease of the Tariff had not been to increase the cost of the article to the consumer.' FAVORING THE U. S. AT THE EXPENSE OF

GREAT BRITAIN. He says he took up, in the first place. cotton goods. In that reference he also

"It was not from any ill-feeling towards our neighbours that this Tar ff was established; but we were gratified when we found that the policy we had introduced to give additional industry to our own people, would strike against the industrial interests of the United States, rather than against those of Great Britain.

According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, page 62, I find there were im ported last year of unbleached cottons. sheetings, drills, ducks, and goods not printed or stained, 8,895,733 vards, on

page 13 of his Budget speech.

the grey and white cottons and brown sheetings that they were selling at 10 per cent less than the price at which they would sell under the Tariff of 1878." But that Tariff was 171 per cent. and under the present one the duty paid amounted to 304 per cent. How can he maintain that goods are sold less under a 301 per cent. tariff than they would be under a 171 per cent. tariff. The additional duty cannot have the effect of making the price cheaper. Two men are turers are not giving the people the benefit in trade, one sells Canadian while the of cheaper products as they should. They other sells imported goods. The one sells are not paying the laboring classess the an object provided they can get what suits | not manufacturing and selling as cheaply them; the other sells to the working as we were promised. They have not yet class to whom the price is a serious matter. The one sells Canadian manu factured goods and the other imported the goods are still imported. The hon. goods at 301 per cent. duty. Will the hon, member tell us that the people do not pay this duty? If the people who bought these 9.000,000 vards of cotton in Europe and paid this heavy duty on then, thought they could buy them cheaper here, does any one suppose they would have imported them and paid this duty? The people who use those goods pay the duty, and the people who use the goods not by 5 cents but by 10 cents a pound, manufactured in Canada pay a similar than the year previous. If the people of percentage on every yard they consume. this country are getting tea at 5 cents a The hon. Minister, speaking of knitting pound cheaper than formerly, the hon. the cottons, referred to Mr. Parks, a very Finance Minister is not entitled to our estimable manufacturer of the city of St. thanks. At present tea is wonderfully John, who, he said, sells a certain class at cheap, and I do not suppose it will ever 39 6-10 cents against 40 cents per pound, the price in the United States market. If those goods sold for 40 cents in the United States market, how does the hon. member explain the fact that \$8.073 duty was paid on the same class of goods imported into this country. Were the people mad in importing those goods from th United States when they could buy them in the factories here 30 per cent. cheaper. The hon, gentleman may console himse.f by smiling over any of these statements. but they are a little too glaring for the people of the country, who intend to get correct information on this subject, and are getting it very rapidly. This Blue-Book is very valuable; it is issued by the Department of the Minister of Customs and should have great weight with the people. The hon, gentleman claimed that his Tariff did not discriminate against the people of Great Britain. I hold a portions of the Lower Provinces except large amount of the cheaper goods-those almost entirely used by our laboring classes are brought in from that country. There were nearly 10,000,000 yards of

INCORRECT OFFICIAL STATEMENTS.

denims, bedticks, drills, etc., imported last

171 per cent. duty of the late Administrathat our people paid no extra taxes .-With such official records as these before us, where is the use of the hon. Finance Minister making such statements s against the whole principle of the sysas we now see published in his budget woollen goods. He said :

to different parties who could furnish me with reliable information with reference to the price of cotton goods, and especially of woollen goods; and a gentleman sent to me, at the request of a friend, a letter, of which he authorized me to make any use I thought proper. I stated to the gentleman, to whom I wrote among others, that I wished reliable data-data that could not be upset by any statements of fact that could be produced in the House-be cause we wanted nothing but the facts. and if the manufacturers were getting large profits, it was just as well that we should know it, and deal with the facts as we found them.

The hon, gentleman gives the name men of first-class standing, no doubt. He says :

"This letter 1 received from Cantlie, Ewan & Co., of Montreal, who, I believe, have been for years engaged in selling woollen goods. It has reference to the comparative cost of certain descriptions of woollen goods made in Canada, compared with the prices of the same goods previous to the change in the Tariff. It is as fol-

" '1st Etoffes, tweeds and fabrics made from Canada wools and used chiefly by farmers, laborers, shantymen and mechanics in country districts are as low in price now as at any time during ten years previous to 1878. This refers to regular sales." The gentleman who wrote this letter shows himself shrewd and cautious the effect of the duty. He does not plain that the cheapness of woollens is largely due to the abundance of New Zealand, Australian and other wools produced, nor that the classes of goods manufactured from them are extremely low in England. The hon. Finance Minister got this statement, but he did not investigate it in order to arrive at the real facts of the case, so as to lay correct information before the people of the country as he should have done. No statement should come from the hon. Finance Minister unless it can be fully borne out by facts. He may plead that his own time is fully occupied but he has plenty of people in his Department to investigate, so that he should give us nothing but correct information on such subjects. What do we find as regards those woollen goods? find that as regards cassimeres, cloths, tweeds and doeskins, there was imported last year into the Dominion, \$3,403.006 worth on which the duty paid was \$1,096 000. Why was this duty | aid? Th duty on this class of goods, imported from Great Britain was 32 per cent., but upon those imported from the United States, 26 per cent. Was not that a discriminative duty against Great Britain? Under the old Tariff the duty would have been but

borne out by the facts. OTHER WOOLLEN GOODS, ETC.

17½ per cent. How can the hon, gentle-

man tell the people that they are not pay-

ing any extra duty on those goods, and

that they cost no more than under the

Tariff of 1878. Such statements are not

The next subject the hon, gentlemen dealt with was flannels and blankets, in I find from this Blue-Book that the duty paid on blankets was over \$81,000. Why why the National Policy should have indid we import those blankets if we could have bought them cheaper manufactured cessive prices? We paid 45 per cent on which an import duty of 301 per cent. was ple have paid those large duties, and yet The hon. gentleman also stated ernment which he has found it impossible previous to this tariff. And in that on with apparent, though not real honesty, part of the world, wish to lean on the world, wish to lean on the world, wish to lean on the work. to reform, and by association with which

opposite tell us that the coal owners it. We find that, on the same class of he and the Minister of Customs are at last ten years, that there has been a raised 350,000 tons more coal last year goods imported from the United States, variance. We also find the same remark advance in wages, and that the condition there was only 25% per cent. duty collec. applies to a large amount of hats, respectted. Does this not discriminate against ing which he has a letter from a very the trade of Great Britain in favor of trade | respectable manufacturer. We are told with the United States? In reference to there was no extra duty paid on hats at these goods, the hon, gentleman said, all-that the people are getting them cheaper than before; yet we find large "I stated last Session with reference to importations and large sums paid into the treasury on those goods. I suppose the only inference is that the people who pay for and wear those goods know nothing about their value, and buy them without any regard to price; that they import such articles just to gratify their whims. We know that the tariff manufactures, and we know it is protecting them, and that manufac increased production equal to the de mands of the country, because one half gentleman also spoke of tea. stating that the people would have a cheap breakfast table, and claiming that they are getting tea at 5 cents a pound less than under the late Tariff. He did not tell us the reason of this fall in price. He did not tell us that India has entered largely into the production of tea, and we know that tea was cheaper in Great Britain last year.

> be as dear as it has been in the pest. THE INJURIOUS EFFECTS OF PROTECTION. I contend that hon, gentlemen opposite are setting a bad example to the people of this country. As I said, they are teaching the youth of Canada, instead of Public Works, Mr. Kelly, of this fact, of relying upon themselves to rely upon the Government in time of trouble. principle is a bad one. It teaches the young men not to do as their fathers did before them These had to endure many privations and hardships, and they made considerable of a country of Canada before it fell into our hands, and if we do as much for it in the future as they did in the past, we may yet have a great country But do not destroy the independence of the youth and teach them to suppose that the Government can assist them in every inancial difficulty, but teach them rather to rely upon their own strong arms for a-sistance, and then Canada will become great and prosperous.

After several other gentlemen had spoken-

year. On that portion from Great Britain Mr. McDougald (Pictou) said: This da we find 33 per cent. duty paid, and the hate has gone on at such length that I had portion imported from the United States not intended to address any remarks to the we find paid but 29 per cent., showing a House, but for some observatious made by discriminative duty against Great Britain the hon, member for Northumberland (Mr. Snowball) in reference to coal. Hi statements are so much at variance with the facts that I did not think I would These taxes the people paid, against the performing my duty if I did not challeng them. I refer, in the first place, to hi tion. Yet the hon. gentleman will tell us observations with regard to the quality of Pictou coal. I had thought that the quality of that coal was so well known and established throughout the country that no man would undertake to disparage it at this time of day. The hon, gentle speech? The next item he dealt with was man asserted that it was, generally speak irg, of a bad quality, although in some "Now, I have taken some pains to write exceptional cases it might be very fair. This statement is not borne out by the facts. If the hon, gentleman will only refer to the quotations of coal in the city of Montreal, where the largest purchases of Nova Scotia coal are made, he will find that Pictou coal-without any reference to any particular locality, or any particular lar mine in that county—is at a higher rate that any other produced in the Dominion. From actual experiments extending over ten days, with large quanti ties, and not from a single analysis, it was proven that Pictou coal was 10 per cent of better than Scotch coal; and in reference the firm from which he got Mis informa- I to the question of superiority, comparing the bituminous coal of Ohio with Picton coal. I will read the testimony of a secaptain, who has had considerable experience in the business :-

MONTREAL, 2nd December, 1879. mond and Ohio coals for steam purposes. I have on beard the steamer Filgate during the past season nore coal was required to give the same result that several years past by the Intercolonial Coal Com

" Yours truly, " Captain S. FILGATE." The observation made with regard to the quality of Nova Scotia coal was a most baseless slander on that great industry, and I was astonished that any gentleman should make such an assertion at this business man, for he does not say what is time of day. Perhaps I should not be astonished, however, because an hor gentleman reminds me that it is in accord ance with the policy of a good many hon gentlemen opposite to decry the industries of their own country. That hon, gentleman also stated that the coal owners were leaning on the Government. That might be true, Sir, of gentlemen engaged in pro ducing slabs and deal ends, [Mr. Mc Dougald heard Sir Leonard saying something like this so he thought it was "statesmanlike." and the Advocate. - EDITOR.] but there no great industry in this country that has received less consideration at the hands of the Governments of this country than the coal industry. In the first place, a great amount of capital is required to establish this industry; the proprietors have to pay a large price for their mines, and for every article used in their equipment, and there is no class of people who pay more to support the burdens of this country than the people engaged in that trade, because they pay a royalty of 10 cents a ton to the Local Government on all the coal produced. The hon, gentleman also stated that the increase in the coal output from 1878 was only natural. Perhaps he meant to say that it was only natural that there should be an increase from 1878 to 1881, under the operation of the National Policy, as he might have said that it would be natu ral that there should be an increase in the deficit under hon gentlemen opposite. The increase in the sales of coal between 1878 and 1881 amounted to 341,000 tons; and, but for the destruction of one of the largest collieries, which had an output of over 100,000 tons, the increase would have regard to which the same censure applies. been fully 450,000 tons. The hon. gentleman also states that he cannot understand creased the export of coal to the West Indies. I think that fact is quite susin this country, and if there was not a ceptible of explanation. We know that monopoly ensuring our manufacturers ex- by the fostering of the sugar industries, our ships now carry coal to the West these goods imported from Great Britain, Indies as a return cargo for the sugar views of every independent elector of and 32 on the portion from the United they bring back. [The Halifax refinery New Brunswick. Those who know Mr. States, a discriminative duty of 13 per is in bankrutcy, so its return cargoes are Wedderburn will, perhaps, not be too cent. against British products. The peo not very heavy just now. - EDITOR.] severe on him for desiring to leave a Gov-

of the working classes is 50 per cent. better than it was during the period the

late Government were in power. [We reproduce the above, as one of the local papers has represented it as a speech that entirely annihilated poor Mr. Snowball.-EDITOR.]

Miramichi Advance.

More Patchwork.

The expedients to which the Provincial Government resorts for the purpose of patching itself up, in order that it may hold together until another general elec. tion, are such as to bring the system of responsible Government" into contempt. From the year 1870, when the infamous Brayley House Caucus" coup d'etat proclaimed that so many of our local egislators were only a lot of place-hunters. down to 1878, when three of the men who were then tricked and duped, joined hands and political fortunes with those whom they had proclaimed dishonorable tricksters, party, principles, pledges and all political decency were constantly outraged in the greedy grab on the one side for office and on the other for recruits. No sooner did a member of respectable talent join the Government than the few manipulators of it were forced to secure for him some juducement, in the shape of outside office, to rid themselves of him. while inferior men, whose clamors were more loud than their influence was strong. were kept within the concern long enough to taint their political status, when they were ignominiously kicked out to make room for the crop that never failed-the crop of needy politicians, whose cry of give! give!" could not be resisted

The feeling of the Province was against the Government early in 1878. So convinced was the late Chief Comm ssioner that, although he had done more for Northumberland in the matter of roads. bridges and other public works than any other representative she ever had, he was forced to seek an asylum in the Legislative Council, rather than risk the verdict which he knew would be rendered through the ballot boxes. During the campaign of '78 Mr. Adams' crowning glory, in his wn eyes, was the fact that, from the ime of the Brayley House affair, he had ioined with Mr. Gillespie in giving opposition to the Government : Mr. Davidson was equally proud of being able to say he nad also opposed the "corrupt faction," while Mr. Hutchison did not hesitate to subscribe to the same political creed.

But no sooner was the election over han Fredericton spiders spun their web bout Mr. Adams. They measured their man. They knew that his aspirations were for office. If he had been sure of it in a new Government he would have preforred it in that way, but he was made to believe (and rightly, perhaps) that Messrs. dillespie and Davidson were equally ligible, so he concluded to let go of his professed principles, to swallow all he had said about Caraquet Young, to forget the Brayley House and J. J Fraser and-hand in hand with Messrs. Landry and Hanington-turn his back on the past, smile on the men he had cursed and join the corupt faction he had denounced.

For some time past it has been as evi-

lent to Mr. Wedderburn in St. John as it was, in 1878, to Mr. Kelly in Northumberland, that the electors were sick of the Government. Rumor had provided for um in the prospective position of police Magistrate of St. John, but, to the surprise of many, he did not appoint himself to that position when it became vacant. -Then came Mr. Elder's dissatisfaction over the Government's mode of filling that vacancy. Those who had watched the moves as they were made and studied the signs of the local political firmament, began to think they had been at fault, but, now, a most startling proposition is sprung upon the legislature in the form of a bill creating a new County Court district comprised of Albert and Kings Countiesrelieving Judge Botsford of the former. and Judge Watters of the latter and rumor says it is to this asylum that Hon. Mr. Wedderburn is to go, and that Mr. Elder is to take his place as Provincial Secretary. That another County Court Judge is not at all necessary is well known. In fact, such an addition to the County Court bench is so uncalled for as to make it one of the most palpable political jobs ever put upon the country and one of the boldest and most outrageous abuses of party strength ever attempted by this Government-fruitful as it has been in questionable expedients for main. taining itself in power. Judge Watters was interviewed on the subject of the new judgeship y one of the St. John Globe staff, on Friday last, the result, as pub

ished in that paper, being as follows:-His Honor said he had no objection to giving his opinion of the matter. The reporter asked if he considered it was necessary that another County Cour Judge should be appointed.

His Honor said it was uncalled for and annecessary. There are now five Judges - Botsford, Stevens, Steadman, Wilkinson and Watters-and they are able to perform all the work, which is not very heavy. The reporter pointed out that it is proposed to give the new Judge, Kings and Albert Counties, and asked if much business is transacted now in the Courts in

these Counties. His Honor said the business is very A large portion of the Kings County business has been and always will the lawyers in St. John control it. The session of the Court in Kings occupies about three days. The Court being held quarterly gives about twelve days work in the year. As to Albert County the Court only meets twice a year, and very few cases are tried-indeed it is doubtful there would amount to more than a few hundred dollars. Another fact to be remembered is that the two Counties combined have only a population of 37,000-a very small number compared with the districts in the jurisdiction of the present

The reporter asked if he had complained of the work thrown on him by holding Court in Kings.

His Honor said he had not complained, indeed there was nothing to complain of for the work was light. He added that he never heard Judge Botsford complain of the labor of holding Court in Albert. In conclusion His Honor characterized the measure as personal legi-lation proposed simply to provide a place for a politician. It is not demanded by public interest. By asking the Dominion Government to pay \$3000 a year for a Judge hip which is not required, alarm may be created, and our just claims weakened. It is asking that an unnecessary tax be placed on the people of the Dominion. It is a measure for which no defence can

Whatever may be said of the prudence of Judge Watters in so plainly giving his convictions to the press, there can be little doubt of the fact that he expresses the commerce I expect to see our future to take the amount of grain that was ex- Government for support. They want to What is this coal duty worth to the Great Britain. I have made up the per- did not pay them—there is no other way ing classes had not improved. I can say, he has tarnished a fair political reputation;