Now Landing
Ex Barque "Paramatta":
DB Bars Best Refin'd and Spike
IRON;
210 BDLS. CAKUM.
S.S. Hibernian (last week.)
Bdls. SLED SHOE STEEL;
Best BOILER PLATES;
151 STEEL PLOW PLATES;
3 Cases Galv'd Sheet Iron.
Per S. S. "CASPIAN" (this week):
Boiler Plates, Best B.B., B. B. B., & Lowmoor.
Bdls. Plating & Hoops, various sizes and gauges.
Nos. 22, 23, 24 and 26; Nos. 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 SHEET IRON,
Bdls. SLED SHOE STEEL.
47 Bundles
TOE CALK STEEL.
37 Bdls. and 15 Bars
RD. MACHINE STEEL,
5-16 to 3 in.
To arrive per S. S. "Phœnix" from Antwerp:
15 Casks SHEET ZINC.
F. BURPEE & CO.

Now Landing
Ex Barque "Paramatta":
17 702 Bars Best Refin'd and Spike
IRON;
210 BDLS. CAKUM.
Ex S.S. Hibernian (last week.)
175 Bdls. SLED SHOE STEEL;
91 Best BOILER PLATES;
151 STEEL PLOW PLATES;
3 Cases Galv'd Sheet Iron.
Per S. S. "CASPIAN" (this week):
139 Boiler Plates, Best B.B., B. B. B., & Lowmoor.
580 Bdls. Plating & Hoops, various sizes and gauges.
318 Bdls. Nos. 22, 23, 24 and 26; 310 Sheets Nos. 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 SHEET IRON,
296 Bdls. SLED SHOE STEEL
47 Bundles
TOE CALK STEEL.
37 Bdls. and 15 Bars
RD. MACHINE STEEL,
5-16 to 3 in.
To arrive per S. S. "Phœnix" from Antwerp:
15 Casks SHEET ZINC.
I. & F. BURPEE & CO.

NOW LANDING.
Ex. S. S. "Peruvian" and "Grecian":—
A FURTHER SUPPLY OF
Best Refined
—AND—
COMMON IRON.
Also---1-4 and 5-16 Rigging Chain,
GEORGE CARVILL,
Nelson Street.

BOOTS AND SHOES.
Spring Goods Arriving Daily.
AT
JAMES McCONNELL'S,
15 KING STREET.

DIPHTHERIA!
JOHNSON'S ANODYNE LINIMENT
will positively prevent this terrible disease, and will positively cure nine cases out of ten. Information that will save many lives, sent free by mail. Don't delay a moment. Prevention is better than cure. Bl. S. JOHNSON & CO., Boston, Mass., formerly Augusta, Me.

WELCOME SOAP!
To Arrive:
50 Boxes of the above superior Soap. I will in future, have this soap regular in Stock. Guaranteed superior to any other Laundry Soap manufactured in the Dominion. Wholesale only.
GEO. MORRISON, JR.

Now Landing
Ex Barque "Paramatta":
DB Bars Best Refin'd and Spike
IRON;
210 BDLS. CAKUM.
S.S. Hibernian (last week.)
Bdls. SLED SHOE STEEL;
Best BOILER PLATES;
151 STEEL PLOW PLATES;
3 Cases Galv'd Sheet Iron.
Per S. S. "CASPIAN" (this week):
Boiler Plates, Best B.B., B. B. B., & Lowmoor.
Bdls. Plating & Hoops, various sizes and gauges.
Nos. 22, 23, 24 and 26; Nos. 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 SHEET IRON,
Bdls. SLED SHOE STEEL.
47 Bundles
TOE CALK STEEL.
37 Bdls. and 15 Bars
RD. MACHINE STEEL,
5-16 to 3 in.
To arrive per S. S. "Phœnix" from Antwerp:
15 Casks SHEET ZINC.
F. BURPEE & CO.

sonable Costumes.
A Further Stock of those Elegant
NCESS SUITINGS
—IN—
ue, Ink, Navy, Ruby,
Caroubier, Burgundy, Seal,
or, Geudanne, Prune,
Bronze, Sapphire,
elveteens, Velvets, Plushes, Brocades and atins to match. A few more Astrachan Fur Jackets, medium size.
ashionable Plush Sealette,
From $4 to $14.
W. JORDAN,
Market Square.

BEVERLY,
Germain Street,
(OPPOSITE THE MARKET.)
mporter and Dealer in
ders and Housekeepers
HARDWARE,
ts, Oils, Glass, Putty, Locks, Knobs, &c.
SHOOTER, FULL NICKEL PLATED
EVOLVERS, $1.25 EACH.
Also, Agent for the best
can and Canadian Wringers.
feb
week in your own town. Terms and $5 outfit free. Address H. Hallett & Co., Portland, marl7
RISTY'S HATS,
lt Hats, Soft Hats,
LT AND SILK HATS,
nts' Furnishing Goods
OF ALL KINDS.
MALLWARES
OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.
sians, Coatings, &c.,
ived the Past Week and will be sold low.
R. JONES & CO.
jan28
MBURG EDGINGS AND
NSERTIONS.
atan Lisse Frillings
C. LAWTON'S SONS,
50 King Street.
MBERMEN'S CALKS,
PEEVIES, &c.
JUST RECEIVED:
00 Lumbermen's Calks,
100 PEEVIES,
and Without Handles.
H. THORNE & CO.,
Market Square.
WEEK. $12 a day at home easily made. Costly outfit free. Address True & Co., Maine. mar18
OUGH ON RATS.
pply of the above. It is re death to Rats.
FOR SALE BY
T. B. BARKER & SONS.
Economy Mess Shad.
BBLS. and HF.-BBLS.
ght Fat Mess Shad.
GEO. MORRISON, JR.
No. 1 APPLES.
ED Winter Fruit to arrive this week: 500 S. NO. 1 WINTER APPLES, all the Favorite lots a portion of my winter stock, carefully selected, and put up by a reliable grower, and good to their kind as comes to market this season. Orders taken, and those now in will be attended to from the vessel.
GEO. MORRISON, JR.
NDY. BRANDY. BRANDY.
Arrived from Charante via Halifax:
Casks Martell Pale Brandy.
" " Dark "
N W. NICHOLSON,
Victoria Wharf, Smythe street.

JOHN WEEKLY FREEMAN
Every Saturday morning from the office LE, 84 GERMAIN STREET.
SON ONE DOLLAR per annum in advance, paid or delivered in any part of the city Portland.
Agents allowed a reasonable rates.

JACOBS OIL
TRADE MARK
THE GREAT GERMAN REMEDY.
FOR
RHEUMATISM,
Neuralgia, Sciatica, Lumbago, Backache, Soreness of the Chest, Gout, Quinsy, Sore Throat, Swellings and Sprains, Burns and Scalds, General Bodily Pains,
Tooth, Ear and Headache, Frosted Feet and Ears, and all other Pains and Aches.
No Preparation on earth equals St. Jacobs Oil as a safe, sure, simple and cheap External Remedy. A trial entails but the comparatively trifling outlay of 50 Cents, and every one suffering with pain can have cheap and positive proof of its claims.
Directions in Seven Languages.
SOLD BY ALL DRUGGISTS AND DEALERS IN MEDICINE.
A. VOGELER & CO.,
Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

1882 Fresh Seeds 1882
T. B. BARKER & SONS
Have just received from the best houses in London and Paris
36 Sacks and Bales
—OF—
FIELD and GARDEN SEEDS
comprising the very best varieties adapted to our climate and soil, in
Carrot, Turnip, Cabbage, Celery, Beet, Mangold Wurtzel, Cauliflower, Cucumber, Onions, Beans, Peas, Tomato, Squash, Radish, Pot Herbs, Spring Vetches, White Corn, Etc.
Also, on the way, to arrive in a few days:
450 Bushels Choice Brit ht Lower Canadian TIMOTHY SEED; 400 bushels Early Fresh Red and Late Mammoth Red CLOVER SEED; 50 Bushels Choice Alsike CLOVER SEED.
Our Seeds are all New, Fresh and True, and will be sold at the very lowest market rates.
T. B. BARKER & SONS,
apr1 35 and 37 King street.

1882 Garden Seeds. 1882.
FLOWER SEEDS.
FIELD SEEDS.
JUST RECEIVED:—A Full Assortment of most choice kinds, among which will be found several new varieties.
Grass and Clover Seeds,
IN DUE SEASON.
R. D. McARTHUR, Medical Hall,
No. 59 Charlotte St., opp. King Square.
P. S. Further particulars hereafter.

St. John Weekly Freeman.

NEW SERIES, VOL. V. ST. JOHN, N. B., SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1882. NO. 34.

The Weekly Freeman.

Saturday, April 22, 1882.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. King's Speech.

Mr. King. I do not desire to trespass at very great length on the time of the House. I quite understand that hon. members of both sides are growing weary of this debate. I have listened with attention to the speeches made on both sides, and have been forced to conclude that on one point, at least, both parties, almost without exception, are agreed—that is, that to-day the Dominion is enjoying a prosperity beyond the measure attained two or three years ago. But while this is the case, I find a marked difference in the views of hon. gentlemen as to the causes. Members of the Government side are not willing to admit that the better times and increased prosperity are in any way due to the increased exports of lumber, to the improvement in the crops, or to any other cause save the National Policy. Though my remarks may be considered somewhat sectional, I intend to confine them to the Tariff as applied to my own Province, New Brunswick. I offer no apology in so doing, believing as I do that the Tariff has worked more injuriously to that than any other Province of the Dominion. I propose to confine my remarks mainly to the leading industries, viz.: farming and lumbering. The hon. the Finance Minister, in his Budget Speech, told us that we had reached a period more prosperous than ever known before; that our farmers had an increased home market, and were getting better prices for their produce than ever they were before. I will quote his own words:

"Manufactories have increased, the number of the employed has increased, and their wages have increased. They have plenty of money with which to buy perishable produce—I speak particularly of perishable goods which cannot be sent to a distant market."

And then he goes on to say:—

"I think it will be difficult to convince the farmer that, under the present policy, he is not benefitted, and that he can be induced, under any circumstances, to oppose a policy that is calculated to increase, as it has done, the value of his produce, and give him higher prices and a better home market than he had before it was introduced."

I admit at once that if the Finance Minister can satisfy the farmers that his policy has produced the change he will have good claims on them for support. It will be difficult to show that such is the case. In the report laid on the Table of the House showing the number of new industries promoted by the Tariff, I find that three are claimed for New Brunswick; one of these is located at Moncton, a sugar refinery employing sixty-five hands; another at Moncton, a lock factory, giving employment to fifty hands; while a third factory at St. John employs twenty-five hands. If I were disposed to criticize sharply that report, I could tell the House that one of those industries was in existence some years previous to the National Policy, and that so far as the lock factory is concerned, the building was in course of erection, and the business was intended to be carried on, prior to the National Policy. But in the calculation I am about to make I can afford to treat the matter generously. It will be seen from that return, that all told, the only claim for the National Policy, so far as New Brunswick is concerned, is that it employs 140 additional hands. I do not know the average wages paid, but I assume that $1.20 a day will be up to the mark. If so, we find that gives an annual expenditure of $50,000 paid as wages to the employees in those factories. Now, by the Census of 1871, it will be seen that New Brunswick had considerably over 40,000 farmers. Allowing for the natural increase, it is fair to conclude that we have to-day somewhere near 50,000. If that $50,000 went directly into the pockets of those farmers it would be providing for each an increased home market to the extent of but $1 per head. I claim that such is not the case—that by no means can it be shown that they receive anything like that amount. For instance, the farmers in New Brunswick do not supply the people with the wheat flour used, which is largely supplied by Ontario. It is known that the farmers only furnish to the operatives in those factories the meat, vegetables and dairy products consumed, which I might put down at one-fourth of that amount, or $12,500, which may be said to go directly into the pockets of the farmers of New Brunswick. This would give them an increased home market to the extent of 25 cents each. To make the matter somewhat plainer it will be found that the average products of a New Brunswick farm is about $300. That gives an increased home market to the extent of one-twelve hundredth part of the products of the New Brunswick farm; or it simply gives an increased home market to the extent of a peck of potatoes to each farmer. But I want to treat the matter fairly and I am disposed to investigate it still further. It seems that the National Policy, by the efforts made on the part of the Government, and the gentlemen supporting them, has induced capitalists to invest their moneys in New Brunswick, and it ought certainly to have produced some results greater than we have seen so far. I assume that, in the next year or two, we are to have some increase in the manufacturing industries of New Brunswick. I am prepared to admit that at the present time they are building a cotton factory at St. Croix which will give employment to 300 hands. In St. John, after a great effort they have managed to make a beginning in the erection of a cotton factory which will probably give employment to 200 more. At Moncton there is another in course of erection of equal capacity. In the city of St. John there is a cotton factory which has been a long time in existence, and which flourished long before the introduction of the National Policy. There are probably about 150 additional hands employed in that factory. All these together will give about 850 additional hands not shown in the returns laid before this House. I assume, that in the next year or two, some other small industries may be created, giving employment to perhaps 150 hands—for instance, the canning industry. I am at a loss to know the rate of wages likely to be paid to the operatives in the cotton factories. It is a little curious that the manufacturers of New Brunswick all seem to run in the cotton line. That is conclusive to my mind that this industry must be receiving protection over and above the other industries of that Province, or else the capitalists would find some other industries that would pay them as well. In looking over the report of the Factory Commission I find that about 75 per cent. of the labor employed in cotton factories is what is called adult female labor, but that includes girls of 14 years and upwards. Moreover, in this 75 per cent. is included the labor of children under 14 years, and many of them under 10 years. I assume that that class of people, at all events, are not in the habit of receiving extraordinary wages. Reports show that the wages paid in Montreal cotton factories average 48 cents per head. I know we have not got as cheap labor in New Brunswick as in Montreal, and I assume that 65 cents would be a fair rate of wages to be put down to the thousand of operatives to be employed in the Province of New Brunswick. This would give $650 per day or in round numbers, $200,000 per year. This is as much as can safely be claimed for the National Policy next year. Next year the farmer according to a former calculation will have an increased home market to the extent of $1 per head. That, I think, at all events, the farmers will not appreciate as a very great boon on the part of the hon. the Minister of Finance. I fancy that will hardly satisfy them for the increased taxes imposed upon them by the Tariff. There is another point. This does not represent the profits of the farmers under the National Policy; it simply represents the increase in the home market. If I were to divide that by six it would come nearer the mark, and that would give less than 25 cents profit. In order to show that the farmers are not benefitted by that, I have but to show that the increased duty on cotton warp would balance the account. But we are told that the farmers not only have an increased home market, but are getting better prices than before the introduction of the National Policy. On that point I have referred to the St. John newspapers published in the month of March, in 1874. The hon. Minister of Finance himself knows that the lumber business was then flourishing, and that that business is the great support of the farmers of New Brunswick. I find that instead of increasing the prices for the farmers the opposite is the case. In a list of eight articles, namely, beef, geese, lamb, mutton, pork, socks, turkey and wool rate to-day exactly as they did then; on butter, buckwheat meal, cabbage, chickens, ducks, eggs, cheese, hams, shoulders, tallow, yarn and oats, the price is 10 per cent. lower. Two articles, hay and potatoes, are higher than they were in 1874. I do not believe any hon. gentleman will claim that the National Policy has raised the price of hay in New Brunswick. Everybody knows that the increased cost of hay in New Brunswick is caused by the injury to the crop last year; and as for potatoes, the potato bug has had as much to do with raising the price as the National Policy. Every farmer knows that the price of this article is regulated entirely by the prices in the Boston market, and they quote prices in Boston instead of the prices in St. John. I think I have shown conclusively that the National Policy has not done very much either in the way of increasing the prices or in increasing the home market to the farmers of New Brunswick. I propose to show now what has been, to my mind, the real cause of the increased prosperity of that Province. Some three years ago spruce logs were sold in the markets of St. John as low as $4.50 per thousand. The price on the average was $5.00 for the best kind of spruce logs. To-day logs of the same description bring $8.00. Deals were sold then at $6.00 to $7.00 per thousand; to-day they are quoted at $10.50 to $11.00. I think that will satisfy anyone who knows anything about the condition of affairs in New Brunswick that the higher price of lumber has had much to do with the increased prosperity of the farmer. But, in order to point out the difference between the home market provided by the National Policy and the market provided by the lumbering industry, I propose to submit a further calculation. The average exports of lumber from New Brunswick is about $5,000,000 per annum. The amount required for home consumption, of course, cannot be correctly stated, but I am safe in putting it down at $1,250,000. This includes the farmers not only supply to the lumbermen such articles as are made use of by operatives in the factories, but they supply in many cases, the standing timber. Then they supply the horses that are required in hauling out the lumber, the hay and oats required to feed them, and a large proportion of the team work required in that industry. I am safe in stating that so far as my Province is concerned, the farmers supply 50 per cent. of the labor required to cut and handle the lumber. In addition to that the families of the lumbermen afford a home market for farm produce. As I before stated, one-fourth of the amount expended in wages in factories went into the pockets of the farmers. Now state that one-half of the whole proceeds of the lumbering interest in New Brunswick goes directly into the pockets of the farmers, after deducting Government stumpage. So we have $3,000,000 to be expended among 50,000 farmers, which affords a home market to the extent of $60 a head, as against $1.25 per head which is credited to the National Policy. There is another point to which I desire to call the attention of the House—a statement made by the hon. Finance Minister last Session and repeated this Session:—

"With reference to the price of oats, we have evidence beyond controversy, in my judgment, and which I stated last Session, after a careful calculation, that it has been increased to the lumberman 3 cents per bushel."

Now, Sir, I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I have had an experience in the lumber business extending over twenty or twenty-five years, and I have never known a time when the prices of logs were so high and the price of oats so low in comparison as at the present time; while oats were, in 1874 and 1875, 55 cents a bushel; to-day there are a drug in the market at 50 cents, and I do not think it would be difficult to show that the decreased price is largely due to the National Policy. The hon. member for Renfrew is generally spoken of as an authority on lumber, but I think it would have been better if to-night he had pointed out how it would be possible to sell articles to lumbermen cheaper to-day than in 1876, when the duties upon them have increased, unless the prices have declined in the country in which they are manufactured. With regard to rubber belting, my experience is that I am compelled to purchase the imported article at an advance of 25 to 30 per cent. The hon. Minister of Finance asserted that there had been an increase in the price of hand-made boots. Now, while the employees of the hon member from Renfrew (Mr. White) may use slop-made boots, the lumbermen of New Brunswick use hand-made boots, and as each man wears about two pairs a year, the result of the hon. Minister's statement, if true, would be to take out of their pockets about one dollar a year on that article alone, at the same time, I deny that the maker of hand-made boots has benefitted by the National Policy to the extent of a single dollar. With reference to the price of lumber the hon. Finance Minister has admitted on two or three occasions that he could do nothing for the lumbermen; but last summer, in the County of Carleton, N. B., it was reported that he stated that his Government had increased the price of spruce logs in St. John. He claimed that by their legislation they had increased the prosperity of the country, and thereby the price of logs, but I think he would have been nearer the mark if he had attributed the increased prosperity of the country to the increased price of these logs. He threw out the idea that the increased price of lumber was due to the increase of home consumption, but it strikes me that the Trade and Navigation Returns show that there has been an increased export of lumber in the past year or two, and that in the face of the fact the export price has been steadily advancing; and I think the retail lumber dealers of St. John will bear me out when I say there has not been a period for many years in which there has been so little demand for lumber for building purposes at home as now. While dealing with matters of detail I might be allowed to point out some old industries which have revived during the last few years and some new ones which have been introduced into the Province of New Brunswick, which have proved beneficial to the country, and especially to the farmers. Since the revival of business in the United States there has been a very large demand for hemlock bark, bark extract, spiling, ship timber and sleepers, and an entirely new industry has been created by the demand for soft wood in the lime-burning districts of Maine. This wood has become an article of commerce and brings a large amount of money into the country, and gives employment to a large number of hands. Furthermore, I might go on and show that the National Policy has proved injurious by compelling the vessels that carry our products away to return in ballast. It might be supposed that no manufacturing was done in New Brunswick prior to the National Policy, but the hon. Minister of Finance has quoted on two occasions in this House, from a report published by the manufacturers of St. John which showed that in 1874 there were 9,000 persons engaged in manufacturing in and around the city of St. John. As to the causes of prosperity or depression among manufacturers I will give my own testimony, but I will read an extract from a speech delivered by a gentleman who differs from me in his political opinions—a gentleman who was a delegate from St. John Board of Trade to the Dominion Board of Trade, which met in Montreal in March 1874—Mr. T. R. Jones, who said:

"There are many manufactories in St. John, including three cotton factories, but assuredly they did not owe their establishment or their prosperity to the protective Tariff which they now enjoyed under the Dominion. They had been before, and were flourishing under the low duties which had prevailed in the Province of New Brunswick previous to Confederation. The great article of the St. John cotton manufacture was what is called warps. A few years ago these were imported. Now hardly any were imported, the whole quantity being made in the country. Nevertheless, manufacturers were like other people in business. They sometimes found the examination of the balance sheets present a blue look-out. But the Government was no more bound to protect them against bad seasons or against the consequence of their own bad management in the shape of over-production and bad debts, than it was bound to protect any other class of the community. In fact, it could not do it. The manufacturers were now suffering mainly from over-production and from the ambitious attempts to make a class of goods which natural circumstances placed beyond their power. Mr. Robertson was quite right in imputing the depression of the woollen trade especially to over-production, and as there was at present no foreign trade, it was quite easy that the over-production when it took place must be peculiarly disastrous. As an illustration of the truth of this opinion, we might mention that there was at Sherbrooke a single mill which, notwithstanding the small population of the Dominion, was larger than any similar mill in Great Britain, with one exception. The fact was that while this over-production prevailed no improvement would be made by increasing the Tariff, whether it was 20 per cent. or 50 per cent. the glut would remain."

This is the opinion of a gentleman who, I believe, is a warm supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, a manufacturer then and a manufacturer now in the city of St. John. But, Sir, what has taken place in St. John and elsewhere in the Dominion may, and is likely to occur again; and when the next wave of depression sweeps over this country, I fancy that many hon. gentlemen who are to-day so ready to invest their money in cotton factories, will have a similar experience to those who came before them. I hope I may not be so, but that they will get ample return for every dollar which they invest, and that we in New Brunswick may keep a portion of the trade within our own borders. I desire now to refer to a statement made by the hon. Finance Minister with reference to the position New Brunswick occupies in Confederation. I had the pleasure of listening to a speech delivered by that hon. gentleman last summer; the audience was very large and very attentive, and the hon. gentleman made one of his best speeches on that occasion. One remark of his, which I have not forgotten, was this:—

"If you charge New Brunswick with one thirteenth of the cost of the Intercolonial Railroad, you have not paid a dollar which you have not got back, you have not paid a dollar for Indians, Mounted Police or the development of the North-West."

Now, I have looked over the accounts for 1881, and I find that in that year New Brunswick paid into the Dominion revenue $1,703,000. I think it would be impossible to show any way in which New Brunswick has directly or indirectly received anything like that amount out of the Dominion Treasury. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Finance that when he again makes that statement, either in this House or out of it, he should give us the details. It is possible that some items may be improperly charged against New Brunswick. For instance, $130,000 expended in that Province last year for the Dorchester Penitentiary, which is for the benefit of the whole Maritime Provinces; then there are the lighthouses on our coasts, which are for the benefit of the shipping of the whole Dominion, and the cost of which is debited in the Public Accounts against New Brunswick. The item of quarantine is also the basis of a large charge in the Public Accounts, although, as has been recently shown in a remarkable case, the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec are as much interested in an efficient quarantine as New Brunswick. Another item which is included in the subsidy to New Brunswick is $150,000 which the Province receives in lieu of export duty. The hon. Minister of Finance knows very well that in an arrangement made prior to our going into Confederation, New Brunswick reserved the right to collect export duty on lumber, and it is not fair to charge that against New Brunswick. The hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech the other day, made the following statement:—

"And, therefore, making every allowance for the duties that would have been paid by the people of the Lower Provinces upon the articles that are purchased from Ontario and Quebec, it will be found that this Tariff, instead of having an injurious effect upon the smaller Provinces, has had a beneficial effect, and it has a still more beneficial effect on the Province of Prince Edward Island,—it will be found that, if any person or locality or section has to complain, it is not the smaller Provinces that were arrayed here, and on behalf of whom the sympathies of this House were invoked, for the practical effect has been a reduction rather than an increase of their taxation under the operation of this Tariff."

Well, sir, prior to Confederation the hon. Minister of Finance told us that for twenty-five years to come our taxes would not exceed $2.75 per head; and I believe that prediction is about to become true under the operation of his Tariff by our exports being so diminished that the amount of the Customs duties which we have to pay must be diminished also; but I submit that the amount of import duties the people have to pay, as shown in the Trade and Navigation Returns, does not indicate correctly the amount of taxes imposed on us by this Tariff. In 1873, the imports of New Brunswick amounted to $10,339,000. That was a prosperous year, but it is not more prosperous than hon. gentlemen claim last year was—that if no change had been made in the Tariff to restrict trade, the natural increase in population would have in this prosperous year increased that amount to over $12,000,000. What are the facts? According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, in 1881, the imports were reduced to $6,016,972, on which that Province paid duties amounting $1,236,632, or $10,000 more than she paid on the larger amount of imports in 1873. The difference in these two amounts shows that New Brunswick is purchasing $6,000,000 of goods in the Dominion; part in Montreal and Quebec in dutiable goods, the balance from the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec. Notwithstanding statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite that goods are supplied to us cheaper than they would be imported, the very fact that it is found necessary to impose a Tariff double what it was in 1873 in order to compel our people to buy these goods, proves that we are paying the duties into the pockets of the manufacturers. It then follows that New Brunswick paid, in 1881, $1,703,972; that we pay duties in Montreal and elsewhere on a part of the $6,000,000; the remainder passing into the hands of the manufacturers is the amount paid indirectly on the $6,000,000 worth of goods purchased in the Dominion, and the whole can be put down as equal to the amount paid on $6,000,000 worth of goods imported, making the total amount of taxation under this National Policy equal to over $3,000,000 in true measure of taxation imposed on New Brunswick. The position of New Brunswick is this: She is unable to find a market in the Dominion for her products; she is obliged to export them largely to the United States. There they are met by a protective tariff which materially reduces their value. The proceeds must be brought back in gold, and in order to supply the wants of her people she is compelled to apply to the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec. There again the purchasing power of her money is reduced by the operation of our own protective Tariff. Her position is between two fires. This it is that is drawing the life-blood out of our own Province; that is lowering the value of real estate in almost every part, except a few favored localities benefitted by the introduction of railways built at the whole cost of the people; that has diverted trade from our chief commercial centres, and reduced rents, particularly in St. John, below a point ever dreamed of. Speaking for myself, if this is to continue—if New Brunswick is to be taunted as being a dependent member of this confederacy and a mendicant among her sister Provinces; if, in the future glory that awaits this country she is not to share, if the only purpose she has to serve is to afford a market for subsidized manufacturers—if I believed this, I would then say sever the bonds which bind her to the Union, restore her to the position she once occupied as an independent Province. But I am not without hope; we have faith in the future of the country, and we look forward to the day when the great Liberal party will be restored to power, when this country will be governed in the interest of the many, not of the few, when monopolies will no longer dare to raise their heads, and when even-handed justice will be dealt out to all the Provinces composing this great Dominion.

Mr. Snowball's Speech.

(From Hansard.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Snowball.—In continuing the debate, I wish to make reference to a few remarks made by the hon. member for West Montreal (Mr. Gault) before the debate closed on Tuesday evening last. From a great many of that hon. gentleman's remarks I have no reason to dissent very much, but, like most hon. gentlemen opposite, he could not go entirely through his speech without making some references which we, on this side, cannot be expected to agree with.

MR. BOYD'S STAMP TAX STORY.

In closing his speech he thanked the Government on behalf of the mercantile community of Montreal, for the abolition of the Stamp Act. The abolition of the Act no doubt is a great benefit to the mercantile community in the Dominion, but the hon. gentleman's version of how it was brought about and my own do not quite agree. I wish to read an extract from the St. John *Sun*, of the 13th inst., giving a different account of the proceeding from that related by the hon. gentleman. At a meeting of the St. John Board of Trade:

"The President read a telegram from Hon. Senator Boyd, stating that it was the petition of the St. John Board of Trade which secured the abolition of the Stamp Tax. Mr. Boyd said he knew this when he asked for the petition of the Board, for although Sir John was opposed to the removal of the Stamp Tax, he left it to the decision of Sir Leonard and Sir Leonard had done this for St. John."

Mr. Boyd, you will observe, asked for this petition. I should like to know why, under these circumstances, Montrealers should interfere in this matter. Their effort to do so reminds me of a story of a worthy couple, called John and Betsy, who lived in the backwoods. John was in the habit of visiting his neighbors in the evening, and, getting elated as many worthy people often do, would boast of his exploits in the past and of what he would do under certain circumstances—that he would venture upon death very readily, not only for the sake of his country, but, if necessary, for a very much less cause. It happened that this worthy couple left the door of their house open, and a hungry bear entered, and made for the cradle in which was their child. John speedily took up his position on the collar beam, while Betsy seized the axe and despatched the bear. When the bear was safely disposed of John sallied forth to inform his neighbors of how Betsy and he had killed the bear. After telling it a few times John omitted to mention Betsy's name altogether and boasted of how bravely he had killed the bear. There is some resemblance in these stories, but Mr. Speaker I do not care who killed the bear, whether John from the upper part of the house, or Betsy from below; what I wish to do is to vindicate the cause of St. John in this matter. We find, Sir, that none but people of New Brunswick were invited to the funeral, and I think it unkind of the people of Montreal to intrude.

THE ONE-SIDED POLICY.

But to return to the debate. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to take a good deal of pleasure in taunting us by saying that we are not agreed on this question of the so-called National Policy—or rather on the extreme imposition of taxes on this country. I can find no such disagreement among my hon. friends on this side; they think, as I do, that the whole system is obnoxious, and we agree upon every step that should be pursued, and I think when the time comes hon. gentlemen opposite will find us in line and ready. They, Sir, are content to follow the multitude to do evil; we warn them against that evil. We do not believe in a system of hot-house protection in this country which may prosper for a time, but is productive of nothing but evil in the end. We might, for example, produce pine apples in this country of a large growth and better flavour than those produced in their native clime, but it does not follow that the enterprise would be generally successful. You can force production in this country, but while, in the one case, you force production at the expense of a single individual, in the other you are forcing a community unwillingly to embark in an enterprise in which they have no interest.

THE N. P. AND THE LUMBER INDUSTRY.

Now, I desire to refer briefly to the speech of the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White). In that speech the hon. gentleman made some statements which, I have no doubt, were candid, and based on such information as he possessed, but as I, like he, am engaged in the timber trade, a few remarks from me in regard to those statements may not be out of place. I may say that he views the matter in an entirely different light from what the people of the Maritime Provinces view it; it must be remembered that the produce of the forest in the section in which he is interested is quite different from the product of the forest in the Province I am interested in; the former is almost exclusively pine timber, while the latter is almost exclusively spruce, and while it does not cost more to bring one to the market than the other, the lumber he speaks of is worth twice as much as ours. Then, again, their market is largely in the neighbouring Republic, while ours is almost exclusively in Great Britain. Now, what governs the price of lumber in Canada? Is it not the value of our lumber in Europe and the value of theirs in the United States? Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that the price of lumber has been advanced by the National Policy? Unless the hon. gentleman can show that we have not to seek a foreign market for our productions of lumber, but have a market for it at home, it is not possible that the National Policy, or any tax on the materials going into the production of lumber, can enhance the price in the foreign market; it only shows that the materials going into the production cost more on account of that tax,—not that we receive more for the lumber that is produced.

WILD STATEMENTS CRITICISED.

But the hon. gentleman asserted that we had a home market, and in connection with that he made a most extraordinary statement. He told us that they sold, last year, 100,000,000 feet of lumber in Montreal city alone, and 80,000,000 feet in Toronto, for local consumption. Let us see how he is able to sustain that assertion. I suppose there is no record to show clearly what quantity of lumber went into the market of Montreal; therefore the hon. gentleman must have spoken from some figures compiled by himself. Now I have the Trade Returns of Great Britain for the year, 1881, which, I think, hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute; and which show the quantity of wood consumed in Great Britain during the year. I suppose the hon gentleman will not claim that the people of the Province of Ontario consume more wood per individual than the people of England. In this country we have many resources to draw upon for our supply, while there they have, comparatively speaking, none but the importation. I find that Great Britain consumed last year 3,321,000,000 superficial feet of lumber, which, divided by the population of 35,000,000 shows the consumption to have been 95 feet per head. Now, multiply the 95 feet per head by 140,747, the population of Montreal by the last Census, and, according to this calculation, the city of Montreal would consume 13,370,000 feet; yet he states that they consumed 100,000,000 feet. Again, there are not so many ways of consuming lumber in Montreal as there are in England. A few weeks ago I visited a clog sole factory in England, the proprietor of which told me that they consumed 15,000 superficial feet per day in the manufacture of clog soles and brush backs, and I claim that when I make the allowance of 13,000,000 feet for the city of Montreal, it is about double the quantity actually consumed there. How is it possible that, without any outlet except the ordinary building trade of Montreal—no extensive packing-case trade or other consumption except the ordinary building trade, which comprises a small proportion of the consumption of lumber in England, that there was an outlet for 100,000,000 of feet, when it is quite clear that it did not provide any outlet for much over 6,000,000 feet. If that statement made by the hon. gentleman is so very incorrect, that he is over 1,000 per cent. out of his reckoning, what reliance can he placed on other statements made by him in regard to other matters dealt with in his speech. He had not the same opportunity of getting so many millions astray, but he was proportionately, astray. If the hon. gentleman made mistakes in regard to pork, beef and oats, that enter into the production of the lumber trade, with which he should be thoroughly conversant, it is not surprising that he went equally far astray in dealing with other points.

THE WHOLE VS. HALF THE TRUTH.

The hon. gentleman went on to make quotations to show what lumber cost in 1878 and 1881, on account of the different values of the products of the farm that entered into the production of lumber in those two years. He told the House that, in 1878, pork was worth $16 per barrel, and, in 1882, $21; that the National Policy had the advantage of advancing the prices of pork to the farmers to the extent of $5 per barrel. Why did not the hon. gentleman take the previous year, 1877, and he would find that pork was $24 as against $21, in 1881? If the hon. gentleman was going to make a comparison, he must prove that pork was never higher than $21 per barrel before the National Policy was introduced; and if pork was dearer before we ever heard of that policy, what had the policy to do with advancing the price? Pork raised in Canada is considered in Europe to be a superior article; it is fed better than that produced in warmer climates. The Canadian pork is supposed to be grain fed, and is worth more for exportation than for home consumption. If so, and we know we have a large exportation of pork, and it is more profitable to ship it to the European market and buy Chicago pork, what has the National Policy to do with the price? Nothing whatever. We do not use Canadian fed pork in the lumber woods. I have had considerable experience in the lumber business, and a barrel of Canadian pork never passed through my establishment, it all comes from Chicago and we pay the duty on it. We find American pork more profitable; it is salted longer, and goes further in the work of the woods than pork produced in Canada. Canadian pork is dearer and we use that which is cheapest.

GIVING THE N. P. THE GLORY.

The hon. gentleman also referred to flour, oats and other grains. Flour is $6.25 per barrel during the present year, against $5.50 in 1878, as he informs us. But if the hon. member will look back to the year 1876, he will find that flour was $8 per barrel, and yet we had no National Policy. But the hon. gentleman will say that when flour was $8 per barrel in 1876—I am not positive of the exact year—we had no flour to sell; but this year we have, thanks to the National Policy. They will not say a word about blessings received from Heaven, no credit is given to God, but it is all given to the National Policy—and the hon. gentlemen opposite.

ONTARIO PRODUCERS AND MARITIME CONSUMERS.

Corn enters very largely into the production of lumber. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House that corn meal, which is so much used, is worth $3.50 or $3.75 against $2.20 last year. Is that due to the National Policy also? The consumers have at all events to pay the 40 cents per barrel which the hon. gentlemen opposite have imposed. These advances in prices, due to a cause entirely different to what the hon. gentlemen wishes to ascribe, may be very gratifying to Ontario producers, but not to Maritime Province consumers.

WAGES AND THE N.P.

The hon. gentleman went on to deal with the question of wages, and detailed the rates in 1878 and 1881. But what has the National Policy to do with it? I would ask the hon. member what induced him to pay the additional wages last year? If he had not given them would the men have found employment in our factories or in industries springing up through the National Policy, or would they not have gone to Michigan and obtained there the higher wages? But the National Policy must remedy everything, according to hon. gentlemen. I feel sorry to occupy the time of the House in dealing with these trivial matters, but if hon. gentlemen put forward these arguments we are compelled to answer them.

The hon. gentleman talks of giving from $12 to $20 per month and board in the lumber woods. Why, Sir, a man came into my mill-yard at Miramichi and took away teamsters, paying them $35 per month and advancing money to pay their expenses to Michigan. Did the National Policy compel me to raise my rate of wages? No, but the advance of the price of lumber in the United States, and the demand for men, compelled me to increase the wages in order to compete and the same causes also compelled my hon. friend to advance, but he now wishes to give the N. P. the credit.

SIR LEONARD STATES TOO MUCH.

Referring to the question of wages, I had better deal with the whole question. The hon. the Finance Minister on page 12 of his Budget Speech,—and I am going to be very explicit in regard to these references—referred to wages. He said:

"The wage in 135 of the factories out of the 460 remained the same as in 1878."

The hon. gentleman