

ships are built to do the business of other countries, or to be sold to residents of other countries to carry their commerce, and when times are dull in other countries there are fewer English steamships employed. Then we are told how bad matters are in England under a free trade policy. I am not advocating free trade; we cannot have free trade here. I advocate a revenue tariff. Would those hon. gentlemen be kind enough to tell us of the depression that existed throughout England before that country adopted free trade? I will ask the members to listen to me while I read from some reports of the state of things that existed prior to the abolition of protection in England:

“EXTRACT from a report upon the condition of the manufacturing industries in England in 1841, under protection.

“BOLTON, December, 1841.—50 cotton mills, formerly employing 8,000 hands, 30 of these mills either standing idle or working 4 days in the week. The Poor Protection Society had 6,995 applicants for relief, whose net earnings were only thirteen pence per head per week. 53 families had no beds at all, and there were an average of 10½ persons to each blanket; 511 families had resorted to pledging or pawning; 609 families had no change of underclothing. There were 1,500 houses uninhabited and a large number not yielding any rents.

“MANCHESTER.—116 mills standing idle. 681 shops and offices untenanted; 549 dwellings unoccupied. In one district of Manchester, as reported by Rev. Father Hearne, there were 2,000 families without a bed and 8,666 persons whose weekly income was 14½ pence per head. Patients in hospitals had increased 15 per cent. The number in prison had nearly doubled. Cotton mills that were deemed to be worth £211,000 had been sold for £66,000.

“BURY.—Only about one-third of the hands employed which were receiving but three and a-half pence per day.

“STOCKPORT.—37 master spinners in a state of insolvency; 3,000 dwellings shut up. Mr. Nelstrop, Mayor of Stockport, stated that 73,314 individuals had received relief, whose average weekly income was only 9½ pence. Thomas Carlyle tells that a cynic had in droll earnest chalked upon a cottage shutter, ‘Stockport to let.’

“GLASGOW.—12,000 persons on relief funds.

“ACCRINGTON.—With a population of 9,000 only 100 employed.

“MASLAND.—2,000 have become paupers.

“LEEDS.—10,000 supplied by relief.

“The above are samples of scores of other cases that can be cited. The clergy stated that thousands of the people did not have half decent clothing and had to absent themselves from church in consequence. Some were so much reduced physically as to be past receiving religious consolation. Others remained in bed as the pangs of hunger were not so keenly felt while reclining. The Duke of Norfolk, a protectionist who from feelings of compassion, recommended that the operative classes who were suffering from hunger should take an occasional pinch of curry powder in a little water to allay their craving for food. Speaking of the corn laws, Carlyle said: ‘God declares against them audibly to all just hearts.’”

Now there is a picture of England under protection in 1841. It was not only manufacturers, but the tenant farmers who were in the condition described, and the depression lasted until there was a change in 1844 or 1846.

Mr. RYKERT. Give us something later than that.

Mr. COCKBURN. I suppose it does not serve the purpose of the hon. gentleman from Lincoln to hear these statements, but if hon. gentlemen opposite had not said so much to us about the present depression in England, I would not have quoted these facts. Now, speaking of England, it does not become us very well to gloat over the depression that exists there; England is one of the most wonderful countries in the world. I do not wonder at the greatness of the United States; there is nothing to hinder it. They possess immense natural resources, and the country could not help becoming great. I am almost reminded of the down-easter, who looked at everything from a commercial standpoint rather than the sublime, said he was not astonished to see water pouring over Niagara Falls for there was nothing to hinder it. There was nothing to hinder the United States progressing. These little gems of the sea, the British Isles, are far greater wonders than any other country under the sun. The United Kingdom contains only 120,222 square miles, and sustains a population of 35,000,000, and furnishes capital to build railways and other improvements all over

the globe. That country sustains a population of 290 to the square mile. The United States contain 3,094,000 square miles, and sustain a population of 50,000,000 people or only 16 to the square mile. In other words, in the United States there are only 16 people to each square mile as compared to the United Kingdom, which has to support 290 people to the square mile. We ought to have good times in Canada. We have had very abundant crops, a large amount of public money has been expended on public works and we have a great country to settle. I have faith in this country. I think matters are sound, thanks to the thrift of the people, although trade is very dull and people can hardly understand why there is so little trade doing. There is, however, an abundance of food in the country. We have had a large number of failures, which would not have been the case under a revenue tariff. We find a great many of the employés in manufacturing establishments have been idle or working short time. A great many no doubt returned to work after a time—no doubt the majority of them will return to work; nevertheless the fact remains that a great many at present are unemployed. In Toronto, which is one of the most prosperous cities in the Dominion, and which always thrives, there are many hundreds of people out of employment or working short time. We find our expenditure has been increased very much. It may be that owing to public works it has been necessary to increase the capital account; but there has been a very large increase in the controllable expenditure, some \$4,000,000, which might have been obviated. For this unnecessary increase we hold the Government directly responsible. There is a very strong presumption that the resources of this country have been frittered away, that in some instances the inheritance of the people has been squandered in order to help friends of the Government or reward political supporters. For instance, with respect to timber lands so called, we find a very pernicious system has obtained in that regard. We hear of a party obtaining \$600,000 for that for which he paid a few thousands of dollars. That immense profit belonged to the people, but it is gone now. There is also a strong presumption that contractors have been receiving large extras, thereby enabling them to make large contributions to election funds. I do not state that it is so; but there is a strong presumption in that direction. I have often wondered where the large amounts of money in circulation at election times came from. From what source did the \$25,000 or more which went to Muskoka and carried the local election come? I did not know there was so many patriotic men who were prepared to subscribe private money. I also wonder where the funds came from which were offered for the purpose of bribing members of the Ontario Legislature a year afterwards. Such practices are very wrong. We have had men in our own party, I believe, who have spent large sums of money at elections. That was very wrong. I am very glad I was not among the number. But it is a fact that considerable money has been spent in that way. Who is to blame? Hon. gentlemen opposite, who refused to give us an election law whereby controverted elections would be tried by the judges. Accordingly, that bad habit prevailed, to some extent, at that time. Some hon. gentlemen on both sides spent large amounts of their own money, and they were very much to blame for having done so. But that was not half so bad as to take the people's money indirectly from the public treasury and use it for election purposes.

Mr. BOWELL I suppose you mean colonisation roads?

Mr. COCKBURN. Colonisation roads accounts in Ontario are all right; you cannot make anything out of them. We find the trade policy not a success. We find the railway policy not a success. We find that constant applications are made for large amounts of money; that final arrangements are supposed to be made but