

lies had an industrial establishment between them. I believe if the hon. gentleman's census commissioners had counted every tinker, tailor, cobbler, carpenter, blacksmith and sewing girl in all those places they would not have made up the list. When I look at what they call manufactures, if I am to judge from the census taken under the auspices of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1881, although they may be technically correct, there is not the slightest doubt that a very false impression will be created in the minds of the people by the grandiloquent statement that so many hundred millions of dollars worth of articles are manufactured. I have not the details for 1891, although the Minister of Finance may have them, and we will probably receive them in due course; but I have those for 1881, and I desire to call the special attention of the House to the way in which the list of manufacturing industries in Canada was made up. We had \$309,000,000 worth of manufactured articles in that year. Of these there was flour to the value of \$42,000,000; bakeries, \$9,500,000; tanneries, \$15,100,000; boots and shoes, \$18,000,000; sugar, \$9,600,000 (it took 700 hands to produce that value in sugar); meat, \$4,000,000; cheese, \$5,500,000; clothes, \$15,000,000; dressmakers' products, \$5,000,000; hatters' goods, \$3,300,000; carpenters were \$3,900,000, blacksmiths were \$7,200,000, carriage-makers were \$6,500,000, saw mills \$38,000,000, sash and door factories \$480,000, printing offices were \$2,700,000—what particular description of manufacture that is, I do not exactly see—paper mills were \$2,400,000, pulp mills \$4,750,000, ship yards \$3,557,000, and shingle mills \$776,000. In other words, out of their \$309,000,000, there were \$202,000,000 which, to say the truth, could have been in no possible respect benefited by the National Policy, or a policy of protection, except, possibly, the single article of sugar. I do submit, that in calling these things manufactures, the hon. gentleman has parted, not, perhaps, from technical accuracy, as his predecessors did, but he most assuredly contributed to convey a very false opinion to the majority of the people as to the extent of our manufactures. I suspect that when these \$470,000,000 of alleged manufactures come to be examined, that you will find in every case as in this, that an enormous mass of these so-called manufactures are hardly things that would be called manufactures at all, and that, in any case, from the very nature of the fact, they could derive no possible benefit, but rather the reverse, from a protective policy. I noticed amongst the \$7,000,000 worth of manufactured goods which the hon. gentleman boasted of having exported, one item for which I give the National Policy full credit. I notice that among these \$7,000,000 worth of goods, there was over \$1,000,000 worth of settlers' goods belonging to emigrants leaving this country for the United States. As to manufactures generally, I desire to say most explicitly, that I neither overrate nor under-

rate, nor wish to overrate their importance. Every man knows perfectly well that manufactures must have a place, and a very important place, in any country at all civilized. I have not the slightest wish to underrate in any shape or form the great importance of manufactures, but, Sir, for all that, I contend that the hon. gentleman is wholly wrong in endeavouring to convey to the people of Canada the idea that Canada has special advantages for becoming a great manufacturing country. I say that Canada is, above all, a great agricultural country; next to its great agricultural resources stands its mineral, its lumbering, and its fishing resources, and next after these, and I admit they are very important, come its manufactures. But, Sir, it is not in our time that Canada is likely to become a great manufacturing country, unless some very extraordinary scientific discovery occurs, and unless the conditions of manufacturing are totally altered, the very circumstances in which we are placed would appear to forbid it. Neither in age, nor climate, nor in density of population, nor from our products, nor our geographical situation, do we possess the advantages for becoming a great manufacturing country which other nations possess, and the Government, I believe, have been doing a very ill service to the manufacturers of Canada, by inducing many men to embark their capital and to risk their whole fortunes in manufactures for which this country was not well suited. There are manufactures which Canada might develop to an enormously greater extent than it has as yet done, and were the United States markets once thrown open to us, and were there free trade from one end of this continent to the other, I would look to see very great development of very many important industries in Canada. As it is, Sir, we resemble men who, having an inexhaustible gold-field at their feet, have chosen to devote themselves to the manufacture of artificial flowers, or, to borrow a metaphor from the hon. gentleman opposite, we seem to be at the present moment like men who, possessing the finest and most fertile wheat region of the world, choose rather to grow oranges in hot houses than to devote themselves to the proper exploitation of the soil. What are the remedies which are offered by us on this side of the House? The hon. gentleman desires to know our policy. I will tell the hon. gentleman what has been our policy from first to last. Our policy from first to last has been to destroy this villainous protective system which has been grinding out the vitals of the people of this country. I do not care in what particular way the reptile is destroyed. I do not care whether it is cut off by the head, or the tail, or in the middle; I do not care whether it is by free trade positive or absolute, or by revenue tariff or continental free trade. I wish to see my people redeemed from the degrading slavery which a few political and commercial knaves imposed upon