

establishments given in these bulletins, we find that the spoon-fed or infant industries only represent a small portion of the industries of the country. I see that the industries which take the largest profits under the National Policy are those which employ very few hands. The cotton mills employ in New Brunswick 1,752, in Nova Scotia 463, in Quebec 3,323, and in Ontario 2,495, making a total of 8,033 engaged in the manufacture of cotton. The sugar refineries, also one of the pet industries with very large profits, and known to be one of the worst combines in this country, employ 212 persons in Nova Scotia and 1,545 in Quebec, making in all 1,757. If we add to these the total number of persons employed in the oil refineries, 270, we find that these three industries employ in all only 10,090 persons. We had also under review the binding twine industry, and were informed that a reduction in the tariff would hurt 1,500 persons engaged in it. But it has been shown very clearly in this House that about 4,000,000 acres of crop in barley, wheat and oats, were cut in the province of Ontario last year; and taking an average of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  lbs. of binder twine per acre, that would give an amount of duty of \$202,000 of which less than \$8,000 went into the Treasury, and the balance, \$194,000, into the pockets of the manufacturers. You see, therefore, that these 1,500 persons engaged in this industry cost the people a very large amount. The farming industry in Ontario represents alone a capital of \$971,000,000, the assessable property being 225,000,000 acres. That would give 225,000 farmers 100 acres each, and if we add fifty per cent to that number for help, allowing one servant to every two farmers, that would give 338,000 persons engaged in that business, whereas in the manufacturing industries the amount invested in land, houses and machinery is only \$172,000 capital, and the capital required to carry on the business for the whole Dominion is \$181,000. The House will see, by this comparison, of what paramount importance the farming interest is compared with the manufacturing, and yet the latter always receives the best consideration of the Government. No doubt the reason is that the farming interest is not brought before the House with sufficient prominence every year. We see that four industries representing less than 11,000 people get nearly everything they want. But they use method, they come here and press their case, and their interests are consequently regarded while those of the larger farming community are disregarded. In my opinion, there are only two methods which can be of material advantage to the farmers in this Dominion. One is free trade with the United States, so far as possible, and the other is reduction in the tariff. Now, I do not agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that the McKinley tariff was not due to any fault on the part of this Government. On the contrary, I believe our

Mr. SEMPLE.

R

Government are to blame in the matter, and shall give you my reasons for so thinking. Mr. McKinley had his Bill before Congress. In the meantime this House met, and our Finance Minister made his Budget speech, on the 27th March, 1890. Representations were made to this Government by the small fruit growers, the nursery-men in the Niagara district, and the millers and others in favour of an increase of duties on the various articles in which they dealt. Increased duties were asked on flour, and pork and beef, and small fruits. These people said, we want a prohibitory duty imposed so that Canadians may have complete control of their own market; and in accordance with their representations, the Finance Minister increased the duties largely on pork and beef, added 25 cents on each barrel of flour, and raised the tariff on apples, clover seed and small fruits imported from the United States into this country. This House prorogued on the 16th of the following May, and the McKinley Bill went into effect the 6th of October following. The Democrats were in favour of throwing that bill out, and so were some of the Republicans, but on seeing the attitude of the Canadians, the Americans said we will treat them in the same manner. They want to keep their small market for themselves, we will keep our large market for ourselves, and the McKinley Bill was passed. Had the Minister of Finance shown judgment at that time he would have waited; but instead of that, by his actions he precipitated the passing of that measure. He helped it on by putting a lever in the hands of its friends, so that I think our Government are justly responsible for that measure which has done so much harm to this country. I was glad to hear the other evening the moderate speech of the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig). He said he was in favour of reciprocity and of lowering the duties, but he wished to wait. That is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. It was the course they took in shelving the temperance question, on the pretence that they wished to ascertain the sentiment of the country, and in the same way, in this matter of reducing the tariff, they have adopted a waiting policy in order that they may stave off the evil day as long as possible. In discussing the advantages of free and unrestricted trade with the United States, I do not consider it fair to compare 1890 with 1891, because in 1890 the McKinley Bill was in force from the 6th of October, and, therefore, part of the year was under the McKinley Bill and part was not. I shall take the year before and compare 1891 with 1889. Now, there were exported into Great Britain in 1891, 1,369 horses, value \$214,785; to the United States, 9,261 were imported, value \$1,094,461. You see, Sir, that even with a duty of \$30 on each horse, and sometimes \$45 and \$50, the United States is really the only market there is for horses. It has been contended that the electric rail-