

to \$8,497,013, or an increase during those five years of about \$1,285,000. Let us see what follows. During the five years when hon. gentlemen opposite administered public affairs, the increase was, in round numbers, \$1,200,000: in the five following years the deposits increased, not one million, but twelve millions. That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to show how much poorer the country is becoming—by referring to the fact that the deposits in the savings banks are increasing. But I venture to say this, that not only have the deposits in the savings banks increased, the amount being now \$43,600,000, as against \$8,000,000 when hon. gentlemen opposite retired from office, but I also desire to point to the condition of the chartered banks of the Dominion, to which the hon. member for Brant referred. And here it is noticeable that the deposits in the chartered banks in 1874, when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) took charge of the financial affairs of the Dominion, and when he was en rapport with the banks of the country, actually shrank from 77 millions in 1874 to 70 millions in 1878. I do not know whether the deposits increased in the Bank of Ontario. The correspondence with Senator Simpson would seem to indicate that in that particular bank the deposits rather increased, for reasons which the hon. member for South Oxford knows better than I do, and which I do not propose now to stop and inquire into, because that matter might come up appropriately on some other occasion when the hon. gentleman is indulging in one of his corruption tirades. Let me point this out, that whilst the circulation in the banks of Canada in 1878 was only 20 millions, and in 1893 had increased to 33 millions, the deposits in the former period were 93 millions, and in the latter 174 millions, the discounts in 1878 were 190 millions, and now 205 millions, and the general assets of the banks in 1878 were only 175 millions, and now they are 302 millions. This is the way in which we are obliged to show how very much worse off the people are than they were under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, by instituting a comparison of the conditions of trade and of our banking institutions at the two periods. Of course, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) could not make a speech without abusing the manufacturers of the country, and it does seem unfortunate that some of us who invested a part of our means in starting manufacturing enterprises in the different communities in which we live, and did so as much with the object of helping those communities as from a desire for personal gain, when we come here, should be called thieves and robbers. Of course, the term is intended to be offensive, it is intended to be insulting, and so it is accepted. But, I say, to brand the manufacturers of this country and the men

who have gone into those joint stock companies, by which manufactures were started in this country and are now conducted, as thieves and robbers, is most insolent, most offensive and most unjust. Only recently, I am told—I read it in a newspaper, for I have not had time to look at the "Hansard"—that a gentleman who occupies a prominent position in the province of New Brunswick, Mr. Alexander Gibson, of Marysville, who is the best known and most prominent business man in the maritime provinces, was grossly assailed and abused in this House because he happens to be connected with some manufacturing industries. Let me pause to point out, that these epithets can be applied as well to the farmers of the country who are protected, to the miners, who are protected, and to the fishermen, who are protected, as well as to men engaged in manufacturing, refining or any other industry. I have always been in favour of a protective policy, and when I advocated it I asked its extension to all classes of our community, to farmers, fishermen, miners, as well as manufacturers: I am not ashamed of it, and I am not ashamed to declare, here or elsewhere, my connection with a manufacturing enterprise. Such industries have not been a source of profit to me individually, but I am very glad to say that they have been of decided advantage to the community or communities in which they have been started. As to the condition of those manufactures, I find that the increase in the number of manufactories between 1881 and 1891 was something like 25,800; that the capital invested in 1881 was \$165,000,000; that to-day it is \$353,000,000; that the number of employees was 254,000, and that it is now 367,000; that the wages paid in 1881 amounted to \$59,000,000, and that in 1891 they were \$99,000,000; that the value of the products in 1881 were \$300,000,000, and in 1891, \$475,000,000. Sir, that is an increase that is gratifying to Canadians. I know that the hon. gentleman who guides the financial policy of the Opposition has no faith in Canadian manufactures, for he has told us distinctly that he does not believe that Canada is a suitable country for manufacturing. I am quite sure that he is just as antagonistic to our manufactures as he was in 1874 or 1878, when by his management of the affairs of the country the sugar refiners were obliged to close their industry. That reminds me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) made a remarkable statement which is being repeated throughout the country, and something similar was started by the leader of the Opposition at a meeting which took place at St. Constance. I cannot quote the words of the hon. gentlemen precisely, but they were to the effect: That the duty which prevailed in Canada during the past year on sugars, refined, was a tariff which put \$2,000,000 a