

Trade and Navigation Returns are given to the public as products of the forest; while in the Statistical Year-Book they are placed under the head of manufactured articles. Shingles, \$755,813, are classed as products of the forest in the Trade and Navigation Returns, but as manufactured goods in the Year-Book. Shooks, boxes and other articles of that kind, are classified in the same way, \$119,212. Sleepers and railway ties, \$214,892, are in the same category. Let us see how this representation works for any given year. Take the year 1893, for instance. The Trade Returns tell us that in that year we exported \$26,539,910 worth of products of the forest; but the Statistical Year-Book tells us we exported of products of the forest in that year only \$5,592,893; and they carry somewhat over \$21,000,000 into the class of manufactured goods out of a total of \$28,462,031 of manufactured goods. The effect of this arrangement would show, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, that our exports were \$7,693,929.

Now, we can imagine the ingenuous youth of the country, we can imagine even older persons anxious to see how the country is progressing in regard to the National Policy—we can imagine them in a country school-house addressing the electorate and showing the enormous export of manufactured goods, and rolling out the figures, \$28,462,031, thus completely demolishing their opponents who have not, perhaps, the advantage of having the Trade and Navigation Returns at hand to show that that list is padded by taking over into a wrong column an enormous mass of goods which have always rightly been considered to belong to the class of products of the forest. I presume the rule upon which this change of base has been made by the statistician, so far as I can gather from the returns themselves, is this: that wherever human labour has been applied to any extent to some natural products, such as animals and their products, or the products of the forest, he calls it a manufactured article. The tree that is just cut down, with the limbs lopped off, he might consent to leave under the head of a product of the forest; but if a slab is sawed off and it becomes a piece of square timber, then he calls it a manufactured article. So he goes through the whole list, and twenty-one or twenty-two million dollars worth of this class of articles he calls manufactured goods. He might as well call dried codfish a manufactured article. There is a much larger proportion of human labour applied to that product, in proportion to its value and size, than is applied to most of the articles which are in these tables. He might as well apply this rule to almost everything on which human labour has been expended and call it a manufactured article. He could by carrying out this proposition to its legitimate conclusion swell the list of manufactured articles exported to many millions of dollars more than it has been

extended, and thus prove the great value of the National Policy, of imposing taxes which have no more relation to the export trade than has the blowing of the north wind. There is no doubt that the natural tendency of high taxation on manufactured goods has been to increase the cost of production, to prevent the development of our natural export trade in manufactured articles, because the cost has been increased, the value has been increased and our ability to compete in foreign markets has thereby been greatly lessened. The other evening the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig) referred to cheese as a manufactured article, and he did so calmly and deliberately, and this member of the House is a gentleman of considerable thought, whose addresses are always received with that consideration which his high character entitles him to receive; yet in a formal address on the benefits of the National Policy he undertook to class cheese as a manufactured article. On the principle laid down by the statistician by which manufactures have been swollen from seven millions to twenty-eight millions, that is perfectly correct, but the principle will not be accepted by the House and the country as a fair means of calculating the development of our manufacturing industries. The benefits of low taxation during the Mackenzie regime and the blessings of providence resulted in great improvement, and I am happy to say, an almost permanent improvement in the growth and development of the great natural resources of the country. These resources are so great as to be almost unlimited, so extensive as to call for the highest powers of eloquence on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite were not created by them; and because we pretend to say that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has been to increase the cost of production on those articles and thereby diminish the opportunity the people have to make wealth out of them, they affirm that we are running down the country. It is not so. There are no hon. gentlemen who have greater confidence and faith and a more wholesome belief in the natural resources of Canada than have the Liberal party in this House. It is because we see those resources fritted away, it is because we see the opportunity to gain wealth and prosperity lost by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite that we attack it and endeavour to show its failures, inconsistencies and improprieties.

The Conservative party declared they would not increase the taxation of the country; but they did increase it enormously. The average taxation from 1874 to 1878 was \$18,989,668 per annum, or an average per head of \$4.81. They said in one breath this was excessive and in another breath they said it was not enough. But when it came to a more definite declaration of the views they held, they insisted that

Mr. FLINT.