

ter very much if I guessed that out of these 75,000 we could well spare 25,000 for more productive pursuits. Now I am a Canadian born and bred, but I have always felt that, excellent as our system of education is, much as it is to be desired that that system of education should expand and flourish, still it is very desirable that that system should be so directed that it should teach our young men in the country that they make a great mistake for their own prosperity and peace of mind when they readily quit the honorable occupation of farming or of ordinary handicrafts to join the multitudes of useless shopkeepers or half employed professional men. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) As I said before, I don't wish to cast any reflections upon these classes *per se*. Many of them are wanted; but in view of the fact that these occupations are nearly all so over-crowded, it is a great mistake that so many of the very pick of our farming population leave the farms on which they are usefully employed and go to the towns to engage in what are supposed to be lighter occupations. You must not only deduct from the national wealth the useless expenditure of those people, which may be put at \$600 per man as a low estimate; but remember that when they are thus uselessly employed they cease to produce at all, and the consequence is that the country must maintain them, besides losing the value of their productive labor. If you calculate the cost of maintaining 25,000 men at \$600 each, and add to that the sum of \$400 or \$500 apiece which they might earn in productive pursuits, you will be able to work out that little problem for yourselves, and judge if there must not be a very considerable impoverishment of the country from that source. I think it might fairly be computed that the loss the people of Canada sustain from that unfortunate diversion of useful labor from the farm and the workshop to the counter and professional desk is not less than from \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 per year, a sum equivalent to the whole taxation required to carry on the government of the Dominion of Canada. (Hear, hear.) According to ordinary statistics the largest standing army you could possibly maintain would be 35,000 men, and if you have twice that number and more employed as I have described, you can readily see what a burden this standing army of 75,000 men must be to the country. The three great sources of our wealth are our farmers and their products, our forests, and our fisheries and ships. I do not say that our manufactures should be abolished. I do not undervalue their importance, nor do I say that there are not available sources of wealth in our minds, but the wealth of Canada must proceed mainly from these three great sources. (Hear, hear.) If there are manufactures which we are able to carry on fairly in this country if there are any for which we have peculiar facilities, Canada will of necessity afford them but a small market, and they will have to seek a foreign market. I say, therefore, that protection for those manufactures which are regarded as a necessity is a mistake, and could do them no good, because we cannot protect them abroad; they must enter into fair competition in the open market with their rivals and win their way by their brains and energy; and I have no doubt they will prove, as many of them have already proved, formidable rivals in the other markets of the world opened to them on reasonable terms. As this policy of imposing a duty of so much a barrel on flour and so much a ton on coal has been one of the standing arguments in favor of protection, I will endeavor to show you what would be the result of such a system. Suppose the people of Nova Scotia required some 500,000 barrels of flour per year, and suppose the people of Ontario required to use, say, one million of tons of coal, and suppose we carried out their theory and put a tax of one dollar or fifty cents on each barrel of flour imported into the Dominion and two dollars per ton on coal, that being the lowest tax which would leave any chance of enabling Nova Scotia coal to compete so far west as Guelph with American coal.

Let us now see what result would flow from this precious bit of protection to the people of Canada. In the first place I beg to say that, bearing in mind that the price of wheat is regulated by the price in England, I don't believe that any farmer or miller here would receive any substantial benefit from the duty proposed to be imposed on flour imported from abroad. But one thing is certain, that the people of Nova Scotia on the first necessary of life would pay a tax of about \$500,000, not into the public treasury, but for the benefit of a few millers and forwarders in Ontario. Similarly, although the people of Ontario require, and will continue to require, supplies of fuel as among the first necessities of life, were those ideas to be carried out, you would have to submit to a tax of from one to two millions of dollars on imported coal, which is to a great extent a raw material in most of our manufactures, as well as positively necessary to a large number of the community. That tax would be paid for the benefit of a small class of coal-owners in the Province of Nova Scotia. The result would be that the people of Nova Scotia, without contributing a penny to the general public revenue, would pay a tax of \$500,000, and the people of Ontario, without contributing a penny to the general revenue, would be taxed to the extent of one or two millions for the benefit of the owners of coal mines in Nova Scotia. (Hear, hear.) The country at large would be just two and one-half millions poorer than it was. And all for what reason? Simply and literally because, thanks to certain natural advantages, Americans can bring their coal to the pit's mouth for ninety cents per ton, while the coal miners of Nova Scotia would require two dollars for the same purpose. We are asked to put on a tax of two and a half millions additional, not for the benefit of the whole people, not to go into the general treasury, but to go into the pockets of a few gentlemen scattered here and there in one end of the Province of Ontario and a few others at the remote end of the Province of Nova Scotia. (Hear, hear.) Over and over again in the course of this controversy has the example of the people of the United States been appealed to. These protectionist orators say: "Your theories may be all right, your doctrines may be sound, but look at the example of the people of the United States. They were protected; they have made themselves into a manufacturing people to their own great benefit, and to the advantage of the whole people. They have reduced their debt, and have become wonderfully and universally prosperous." Statements like these are becoming much fewer than they were. Unfortunately they are the exact reverse of the truth. Those who appreciate the terrible depression which exists in the United States at the present time have begun to understand that a policy producing such results cannot be much relied on. But, lest you should suppose that I am ignoring the case of the United States, that for my own ends I am misrepresenting the real condition of the people of that country, I desire to give you the most unimpeachable testimony in the shape of an extract from a speech delivered in Congress by an eminent statesman of that country, who dared to speak of the situation in the United States as follows, no longer ago than last February:—"We are all familiar with the accounts of unparalleled and increasing destitution among our own working population. Let not repetition dull our minds so that we cannot see, nor steel our hearts so that we cannot feel, the force of facts so often told and so well authenticated. In some of our larger cities the present is the third winter when two-thirds of the unskilled laborers have been unable to find employment. Nevertheless multitudes of temperate, industrious, and well-trained mechanics, and of young women with honorable independence of character and sensitive about receiving charity in any form or shape, have lost all hope, and in the depths of destitution and despair are begging to be saved from lingering death from hunger by being sent to places intended for the reception of vagrants and criminals. . . . The representatives of the Boston Board of Trade as-

sert that the people of Massachusetts are deeply impressed, as are many others in all parts of our country, with the fact that difficulties and depreciation are besetting every branch of industry. These formidable disasters are not confined to the great cities, but even in the smaller manufacturing towns, also, are found people seeking for work, and the general cry is: 'It is our trade relations that are wrong and unsound; what have you to suggest to lift us out of this slough of despond?' . . . Is this the prospect, or are the facts as we now find them to be thrust aside as if of no moment, and the present depressed condition of our trade and manufactures? Year after year the plight of our laboring men throughout the country, and especially in the regions dependent on manufactures and commerce, has grown worse and worse. Year by year since 1872 the attractions presented to the laborers of Europe have sensibly diminished, until in the last fiscal year the immigrants to our shores were less by nearly three hundred thousand than they were four years ago, the actual reduction within that time having been from 637,750 to 169,986. These new comers go it is to be supposed, to friends who are ready to receive them, chiefly in those parts of the country least affected by the prevalent distress." There you have the opinion of a leading representative of the American people, delivered on the floor of Congress, as to what that system has done for that country. Is that the system, so tried, so proved, so experienced, which we show such gross incompetence such blindness, such gross ignorance, such want statesmanship in refusing to adopt? (Hear, hear.) What! now, when Canada is in a state of deep distress and depression; when the people find it hard enough to pay their way, is this a time when we should put further burdens upon their backs? (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I leave it to you now, and next year when you shall have to decide what policy you shall have, to give the answer; but I do say, without fear, that the intelligent and honest judgment of the people of Canada will render just such a verdict as they have rendered before. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

ASSIGNMENTS IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC DURING PAST WEEK.

A. Bertrand, grain, St. Johns.
L. Miller & Co., general store, Kamouraska.
J. J. Provost, grocer, Joliette.
R. Duna & Co., dry goods, Montreal.
G. A. Barnett, tinsmith, Sherbrooke.
J. Mennier, hotel, Montreal.
M. J. Louergan, Montreal.

WRITS OF ATTACHMENT ISSUED VS.

F. Verrault, trader, St. Joseph Beauce.
St. Johns Glass Co., St. Johns.
Webster & Sleeper, St. Johns.
J. B. Sagazat, grocer, Montreal.
John Parker, brewer, St. Johns.
McLeod, McNaughton & Leveillé, brewers, Montreal.
L. Sloggett, trader, Cowansville.
A. Boisvert, grocer, Montreal.
A. Drouin, trader, Montreal.

ASSIGNMENTS IN ONTARIO DURING PAST WEEK.

H. McGilvery, trader, Bradford.
H. Culbert & Co., grocers, Brockville.
John Swan, tinsmith, Drayton.
G. Kratzmeir, trader, Hamilton.
Currie & Johnston, auctioneers, Goderich.
W. W. Boughner, boots and shoes, Chatham.
J. Shannon, jun., cheese factory, Stratford.
R. H. Smith, saloon, Port Hope.
J. Robinson, trader, Kingston.
J. Fletcher, hardware, Brockville.
J. Jackson, furniture, Cobourg.
Fraser & Johnson, brokers, Windsor.
H. G. Ford, trader, Kerwood.

WRITS OF ATTACHMENT ISSUED VS.

S. Wismer, general store, Mapleton.
John Scott, Maryborough.
Wm. Ross, trader, Toronto.
Jas. Cavanagh, Rockwood.
S. Smith, news agent, Toronto.