

to greatness depends on a single industry. Not many years have elapsed since Canada possessed few industries, but, within recent years, a great advance has been made in that respect. A reference to the Statistical Year-Book shows that in Canada in 1881 the capital invested in manufactures only amounted to \$7,000,000, with a total yearly output of \$209,000,000, and in the past ten years these amounts have been vastly increased, nearly, if not quite, 100 per cent; and I am proud to say that nowhere has that increase been more marked than in the city of Hamilton. When we think of the large amount of wages paid out, and the number of hands employed, the figures speak volumes for our industries, and they indicate the excellent prospects of our Dominion. The public generally are beginning to see—not only Conservatives, but Reformers—that the policy of protection is the best policy for this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of speaking to farmers who live away from manufacturing cities and they tell them that the manufacturers are destroying them and ruining them, and making them pay heavier taxes than they should pay. I will be able to show you, Mr. Speaker, that those who live in the neighbourhood of cities and in manufacturing centres appreciate the benefits conferred upon them by the protective policy and, to my knowledge, in many cases they have set their political feelings aside and have voted for the National Policy, because they know it is to their own interests to do so. There was a by-election in the city of Hamilton about two weeks previous to the last Dominion election, and the Hon. J. M. Gibson, a Liberal, was elected to the Ontario Assembly at that by-election by over 700 majority. But in spite of that, two weeks after, Mr. McKay and myself were elected supporters of the National Policy by over 600 majority. That proves that over 1,000 Reform votes wheeled into line in support of our protective system. Hamilton was generally known as a Reform city, but lately its people have begun to see that the National Policy is for the benefit of property holders and wage-earners, and all classes of the community, and they now support that policy. I remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the time of the Mackenzie Government you could walk street after street in Hamilton and see "To Lets" on dozens of vacant houses. That is altered now, and bankers, and merchants, and the people generally, know that the change is to be attributed to the policy of the present Government. Our American friends protect their manufactures, and they protect their people as well. If one of our sons goes over to work in the United States the first reception he gets is, that they tap him on the shoulder and say: Young man, go home; whereas we allow United States citizens to come into Canada and take their chances with the rest of us. Now, Mr.

Mr. RYCKMAN.

Speaker, I claim that Canada has made more progress than any other country under the sun, considering her age and population. The high standard of our products prove this. Our cheese ranks as high as that of any other country in the world. Take our apples, our wheat, our barley, our beef and mutton, and they are prized in every market to which we send them. I may say, Sir, that during the latter part of this week I visited New York city, and I was taking dinner with a friend, who said to me: Mr. Ryckman, I suppose you will be glad to have a little Canadian lamb. I replied that I would be glad at any time to take anything Canadian. "Do you know," said my friend, "we pay 3 cents more a pound for Canadian than for American lamb here." I asked, "How is that?" and the answer was: "I do not know whether it is the breed or not, or whether it is fed better, but, at all events, we pay it because we like it better." That shows you, Mr. Speaker, that our products are valued in the American markets. Take our institutions, and we find that they are equal, if not superior, to those of any other country. Our banking system is good, and no one can find fault with it. Our postal system is good. In fact, an American gentleman wrote me last year asking me for some information with regard to our post office order system, and he said that they wanted to improve their system in the United States, and they thought that by adopting something such as we have in Canada they would be much better off. We all know, Sir, that our national credit stands high in the money markets of the world. Let me ask: What have hon. gentlemen opposite to offer to the people of this country in lieu of the policy of the present Government? What policy do they propose to the farmers and to the people of this country generally, at the next election? They have latterly announced that they are in favour of free trade. Well, Sir, if they go to the country on that cry, I have not the slightest doubt that they will be beaten worse than in any previous election since confederation. We are lying alongside a great nation to the south of us with a high protective system in force; and how, in view of that, can any political party honestly appeal to the electorate of this young country on such a policy as free trade? I remember that not very long ago, the Liberal party was not quite so pronounced on the question of free trade as they seem to be at present, and when they shifted their policy around from one scheme to the other. At the present time they are following a somewhat similar course. To the farmers they say: We will give you free trade; but when they are speaking in a manufacturing centre, their cry is: Gentlemen, manufacturers, we are not going to hurt you very much; your protection has got to come down sooner or later, but we will take it down by degrees.