

s. Capital.
57 16,736,703
98 7,675,311

00 2,307,540
20 697,509

80 4,159,481
49 2,172,100

50 8,624,803
79 3,995,782

72 8,029,621
90 3,798,861

24 2,592,984
41 1,630,598

ere not sep-
and thus :

Output.
\$6,749,056
3,738,246

ms in our
have 12-
s in 1878;
, these mills
ad children;
t time they
y they are
withstanding
en opposite,
asterly way
Bruce (Mr.
sold here,
p as in the
friend from
. He would
evidence I
pursue the
as to sugar
re four re-
they employ
y? Not a
and not a
d. In 1891,
their product
icy of the
e industries
t of foreign
s, or from
icularly as,
ective tariff,
which has
adian can
which my
(Mr. Pater-
a. friend is
at the Na-
. I think I
"Globe":
you rich?"
e hon. gen-
and I am

glad it has. But the hon. member says that is not the question; has it done anything for you? I tell my hon. friend that he could not grow rich without affording opportunities for labour to hundreds and thousands of people through all these years; and, as he has grown rich he has, I have no doubt, paid his people a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. I am glad to know that the men who work for him have been buying their houses and growing rich as well. Well, Sir, Mr. Paterson's confectionery works, according to the commercial reports, were rated in 1878 at from \$6,000 to \$10,000. In 1895 it was rated at from \$75,000 to \$150,000. Then as to other industries there: Buck's stove works, in 1878, were rated at from \$50,000 to \$75,000; to-day they are rated at from \$200,000 to \$300,000. Harris, Son & Co., agricultural works, were rated, in 1878, at from \$30,000 to \$50,000, and to-day their works are assessed at \$135,000. The Waterous engine works have risen from \$150,000 to \$200,000 or \$300,000. And only the other day, when the Waterous Company proposed to leave the city of Brantford, the city granted them a large bonus, which is, perhaps, the most expensive protection we can possibly have, and if the hon. member for South Brant were here I would challenge him to deny that he had voted for that bonus, because he was anxious to keep these people in the city of Brantford, for the reason that, as the paper supporting him declared, it was better to keep them there if they could, not only to give strength and prosperity to the city, but to afford a market to the farmers around the city. But my hon. friend from Brant has been making a public utterance as to his own business under the National Policy. He admits that he prospered, but he says it is not due to the National Policy. Speaking last fall he said as follows:—

He would make the comparison with 1893. The National Policy was to keep the Canadian market for the Canadian manufacturers. Well, in 1878, \$88,000 worth of candles came into Canada; in 1893, \$86,000 worth came in. It kept out \$2,000 worth—only \$2,000 worth all over the Dominion. In biscuits, Canada imported in 1878, \$24,000 worth, and in 1893 we imported \$32,000 worth. What chance had Mr. Paterson to be rich with that? In 1878 \$97,646 worth of pickles came into the country, and in 1893 it had risen to \$109,580 worth. Those figures did not bear out the assertion that the National Policy had made him rich.

In that is a very ingenious statement. But what has become of the greatly increased consumption? It is true that the imports are about the same. Had it not been for the National Policy they would have been much larger and we should have been using the products of foreign labour. The way to measure the fourth of the business in which he is engaged is to look at the evidence of

these figures. As to pickle-making and bakers and confectioners:

Pickle-making—

Establishments	3	17
Hands employed	25	89
Wages	\$ 4,200	\$ 20,090
Output	24,000	119,000

Bakeries and confectioneries—

Establishments	1,180	1,836
Hands employed	3,963	7,043
Wages	\$1,122,266	\$2,283,553
Output	9,476,975	15,433,108

It will thus be seen, Sir, that the market has grown immensely, and that Canadian labour has been supplying it. This fact the member for Brant did not mention. Just a word or two as to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). You remember, Mr. Speaker, that last year when the question of canned tomatoes came up in this House, my hon. friend was extremely solicitous about a cent being taken off canned tomatoes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Peaches.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Peaches, yes; but tomatoes as well. Peaches and tomatoes were the especial object of my hon. friend's solicitude then, just as wrecking privileges were the especial object of his solicitude in other days. Well, Sir, what is the reason that he is so anxious about canned tomatoes and canned peaches? I find that in 1881 there were four canning factories in North and South Norfolk. I do not think there were any before 1878. I find that the capital invested was \$13,000; that the number of hands employed was 91; and that the value of the produce was \$34,000. I find that in 1891, under this iniquitous policy which my hon. friend denounces from platform to platform, the number had not increased, but that the capital had risen from \$13,000 to \$144,000, that the number of hands had risen from 91 to 409, and that the value of products had risen from \$34,000 to \$273,000. These figures are for the county of Norfolk alone. This explains the anxiety of my hon. friend that these canning men should have a special advantage. Well, he was anxious for them, but he was anxious for the farmers of the county of Norfolk who have devoted their fields to raising the articles which are used in these canning factories, and out of which the farmers are making more money than they possibly could in any other line from the same soil. Taking the country over, in animal and vegetable goods, canned and cured, in 1881 the wages paid were \$4,432,000; in 1891 the wages were \$8,408,992. And how have prices ruled? I sent down to Mr. Kavanagh's grocery, in Sparks Street, Ottawa, to get the prices, and I found out that before the National