

manufacturing interests which has been laid before this House by the Finance Minister, and it has been derided and spoken about in a way anything but complimentary. I am free to say that that report does not give a full and particular account of all the industries of the Dominion. It never was intended that it should. It would be quite impossible for any one man or any half dozen men to go from one end of this Dominion to the other and give a full and particular account of its industries and make comparative statements between 1878 and 1884. It does not pretend to do that, and with reference to the city of Hamilton alone it leaves out a great number of most important institutions. My colleague and myself, of our own knowledge, here in the House, have been able to go over that statement and show that at least 50, if not more, important establishments have been left out. I suppose the report meets the purpose for which it was intended. It gives a certain number of institutions that were in vogue in 1878, and a certain number that have been established since that time, and they draw a comparison and show that of these 62—we take the city of Hamilton—40 of them were erected before 1878, and 22 since, showing the comparison, the increase of capital invested, the amount of wages paid out weekly, and the amount of products that have been turned out. I might mention that in that report so important a concern as George E. Tuckett & Sons' tobacco factory, one known all over the world, is omitted. R. M. Wanzer & Co.'s great sewing machine establishment is left out; R. M. Wanzer & Co.'s great screw factory is left out. Now these are very important establishments, and the hon. gentleman had the audacity to say that "Wanzer & Co.'s establishment was not employing one-third the number of men this year that it was in 1878." Well, all I can say to the hon. gentlemen is this, Mr. Speaker, that R. M. Wanzer & Co. have added to their capacity for turning out work within the last year, buildings and machinery which have cost them \$100,000; so I think that is something which goes to prove a state of affairs contrary to that asserted as existing by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Then, Sir, we have another establishment in Hamilton, which was built immediately after the National Policy was introduced—an extensive coffin factory erected, as was jocularly said at the time, for the purpose of burying the clear Grit party. We have also got a very large baby carriage factory, which is evidence of a great increase in population. So you see that putting one against the other the rising generation being protectionists, those who are being buried are free traders—the result is inevitable! I will not take up time by enumerating the other establishments erected since 1879, because it is unnecessary to do so; but they are large, numerous and extensive, all of which goes to show that the city of Hamilton, which the hon. gentleman endeavored to belittle and detract from, is one of the most flourishing in the Dominion of Canada. So much for the city of Hamilton. I must now, with leave of the House, notice some of the figures the hon. gentleman gave us by way of proving that the duty does not keep articles out of the market. The hon. gentleman said in his speech:

"High taxes have been imposed, and for what? Why, hon. gentlemen opposite say, for the purpose of keeping away the foreign products, and making Canada a close preserve for the manufacturers of Canada. We want to have Canada for the Canadians. But has that been the result of the policy? Take the case of the importations. The following table shows the importations in 1879 and 1883 of a number of leading articles."

Then he enumerates carriages, boots and shoes, blankets, furniture, and that sort of thing, and gives the importations, some of them very insignificant—stoves, for instance, \$34,212; whips, a good article—some gentlemen ought to have them applied to them—\$3,383. He goes down into these small articles for the purpose of proving that the duty

does not keep the articles out of the country. I did not understand that it was ever supposed that the tariff would create a close market, that it would prevent other countries from exporting into Canada, or prevent the inhabitants of this country from importing from other countries. It was intended to secure the markets of this country for such articles as we could produce, while such articles as this country could not manufacture, or could not manufacture a sufficiency of—of course the people must have them, and they would get them from abroad. But I submit that the hon. gentleman, like other hon. gentlemen who have followed him on that side, has not given us a fair, candid and upright statement with reference to the very articles he has mentioned. If he wanted to show to the House and to the country the real state of affairs that exist to-day with reference to the National Policy, and to compare it with the state of affairs which existed before that policy was introduced, he should have taken the year 1878 and compared it with the year 1884. And so I propose to do with not a few of the articles the hon. gentleman has mentioned. I do not intend going over the whole of them, because there would be no profit in that, and we have already lost time enough over this subject. The hon. gentleman mentions blankets, for instance, and he says that there were \$201,070 worth imported in 1879, and in 1883, \$265,956 worth. But according to the returns the importation in 1878, before the National Policy was introduced, show a very different figure. In that year there were \$226,946 worth, and in 1884 they come down to \$122,178, being less than one half of what they were in 1883. Then take furniture. The hon. gentleman shows that in 1879 there were \$247,970 imported, and in 1883 \$264,360. Now, what was it in 1878? In 1878 there were imported into this country \$399,330; in 1884, only \$206,436 worth; showing a very great decrease. The hon. gentleman did not want to show these figures; he did not draw the attention of the House to them. He evidently must have compared the Trade Returns of 1883 and 1884, and he chose to take those of 1883 and 1879 and compare them and leave out those which would give the real and true test of what this country is doing at the present time as compared with 1878, when a different tariff was in force. The hon. gentleman also refers to pianos. He says that the importation of pianos in 1879 amounted to \$289,631, and they increased in 1883 \$328,774. Well, what do we find? In 1878 the importations were \$353,466 worth; in 1884 they were only \$288,855, showing a very great decrease. And we have to take into consideration this fact, that the most expensive pianos are not made in this country; they are chiefly made in the United States, and the importation of this class of pianos mount up in value very much more speedily than the ordinary article manufactured in this country. I do not mean to say, Mr. Speaker, when I allude to pianos in that way, that there are not splendid instruments manufactured in this country, some very excellent ones, indeed; but we do know this, that musicians have their fancies and their pets in pianos; they will have a particular make and no other, and that fact militates a good deal against the Canadian piano, although in many cases Canadian pianos are quite as good as the very best that are imported into this country. But I notice that the hon. gentleman cunningly left out of his list one of the most important musical instruments, the one that tells the story best as to what the National Policy is doing for this country—certainly with reference to musical instruments. We all know that the manufacture of organs is a very important industry in this country; we all know that the great mass of the people have them; nearly every well-to-do farmer possesses an organ, or a melodeon, or a piano. But this item of organs shows what the country requires and is able to pay for in the way of musical instruments. We find that in 1878 we imported organs to the tune of \$121,525