

although there had been an increase in the manufactured products, that fact was no evidence that the people were better off. He said :

"Where are those millions of money that were to be invested in the country if the National Policy was passed. I want to know where the millions are. Will the member for Cardwell tell me? We have paid some hundreds of dollars—I do not know whether it will not run into thousands—for commissioners to go through the country to find evidences of prosperity. They have not found these men; they have not found these millions."

That hon. gentlemen was most unfair, because if he had wished to be fair, he would not have overlooked the fact that the report of the commissioners who went through the country examining the condition of our manufacturing industries stated, in language as plain as language could be made, that there had been brought into this country a capital of \$79,560,000, or, at all events, that that much additional capital had been invested in addition to what was invested in these industries in 1878. Yet the hon. member asks where are those millions, for he has been unable to find them. It has been said before, and I think it will apply with equal force now, that no one is so blind as a man who will not see. The hon. gentleman asked where are the thousand of men who were to be employed; where are the large quantity of products which was to be turned out if this policy was adopted? He overlooks the fact that products to the value of \$59,966,000 was produced as the result of that policy in 1884 over 1878, and there were employed 51,528 men. I should like to ask this House and the country whether it is reasonable to suppose that employers could employ that large number of men and expend that large sum of money and turn out that large amount of product without, at the same time, producing an improvement in the condition of the people. It is most unreasonable, and it cannot be successfully established by any hon. gentleman, either here or elsewhere. Then he went on to speak about the woollen manufacture. He says that although we have three millions of woollen goods manufactured in 1884 over 1878, yet, because there is no evidence of any importation of the raw material, it is impossible that that was the result. The hon. gentleman did not look at the figures showing the large amount of wool we have in the country; showing that we have been for years accumulating wool in the country; showing that it had been raised in large quantities, and that the National Policy was accomplishing what was claimed by the Finance Minister when the tariff was introduced, namely: That it would give us at least the privilege of using up what we raised at home, and manufacturing it for the people, and thereby converting it into a source of wealth. Now, I may ask again, in reference to the railway policy of the Government, is it reasonable that we should build 4,000 miles of railway inside of five years, expending, as has been expended, \$92,000,000, largely brought in from other countries, without it doing any good to the country? Is it reasonable to suppose that we could expend, not only on railways, but on canals and post offices and Custom houses throughout the country, large sums of money, and that the people should be no better off? Is it reasonable that we could employ the 51,828 people who are shown to have been employed in 1884 over 1878, in the factories of the Dominion, and yet to say that the country is no better off? Is it reasonable to suppose that we could employ the 20,000 who have been employed in building the Canadian Pacific Railway in the last few years, and yet that it is no good to the country? I think that logic which would satisfy any man that that is the case is the strangest I ever heard of. Hon. gentlemen from the western part of Ontario, in dealing with this question, have always steered clear of the evidence which was plainly before their eyes, and they have gone to the Maritime Provinces to hunt up arguments. Take for a moment the additional market that is given to our farmers and producers generally, by the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I have before me a small cutting from a paper, showing the amount of stuff that was shipped from the port of Owen Sound, to supply some of these hands on the Canadian Pacific Railway during the last year. This is only one port, and in addition to Owen Sound we have Meaford, Collingwood, Southampton, Kincardine, Midland and Penetanguishene, and if you take these and collect the aggregate returns from these different ports, showing the total amount of the local produce of our country that finds a good market there—a better market than in the East—it will enable us to understand what the improvement has been in that part of the country, from the policy of the present Government. We shipped from Owen Sound last year no less than 8,460 head of cattle, and these were largely taken from the counties of Grey and Wellington—from the county represented by my hon. friend, which I have shown has increased so largely in wealth during the last few years, and from my own county. Still, hon. gentlemen say that the policy has done no good to our country, and has given us no increased market. We had in the port of Owen Sound during the last year—

Mr. COCKBURN. How much will you ship next year?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know, but it will be a great deal more. We had in Owen Sound 1,064 steamers, representing a tonnage of 463,366 tons. And I say that every one of these steamers was kept busily employed carrying on the trade between that port and the upper lakes, supplying the men employed on the Canadian Pacific Railway, thereby giving us an increased market, and an increase in the wealth of the people of that country from that source. These steamers employed no less a number than 15,881 men. Is that no benefit to the country? That is evidence from only one port; and when you remember there are a number of ports on Lake Huron and Georgian Bay that are sending stuff in the same direction and in equally large proportions, it is an evidence that we are receiving a great benefit from the building of that railway. With reference to the second proposition of hon. gentlemen, that I spoke of at the outset, they state, in the first place, that the country is no better off since the introduction of the National Policy, and in the next place that, if the country is better off, as some of them admitted it was, it is not due to the National Policy or the railway policy. What is it due to? What is this large expenditure of \$91,000,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway by the company, in addition to what the Government spent, due to? Is it not due to the Government's policy of building the railway? Is it not due to the system of building the railway, and that is only a policy? Can hon. gentlemen safely say that the Government had no policy at all, and that no benefit is accruing from that policy? What is the large showing given to us of the increased number of factories in this country due to? Is it not due to the National Policy? We found these factories waning and dying out, and the number of hands employed previous to 1878 decreasing, but since that time they have been growing rapidly year by year. I would call their attention for a short time to the sugar refineries that have been started, to the cotton mills that have been built up in the country, and to the various manufacturing establishments which have grown up in every part of the country since the present Government came into power. And I would ask, do the people of the country appreciate the great benefits they receive? We have the strongest reasons for believing that they do, for although from 1878 to 1882 the Opposition were endeavoring to prove that they were being injured by the policy of the Government, that it was their duty to turn the Government out of power and put others in their places, strange to say they failed to convince the people of the country of that fact, and the result was that the Government came back as strong in 1882 as they were in 1878. We have