

operatives, textile manufactory operatives, not specified, manufacturers and officials of manufacturing companies, mineral and soda water makers, glass blowers and workers, hat and cap makers, hosiery and knitting mill operatives; my hon. friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright) had something to say as to the amount they made—linen mill operatives, oil works employees, organ makers, rope, twine and cordage factory operatives, sugar makers and refiners, umbrella and parasol makers, and silk mill operatives. And all totalled up they number some 30,000 people. And this is the sum total of the people who are directly influenced or affected beneficially by the National Policy. And that, Sir, out of a total of 1,659,000 who are engaged in different occupations and avocations in this Canada. Now, Sir, I say that this system is an unjust and unfair system because, while it is a system of protection so far as the goods market is concerned, the hon. gentleman has never had the pluck to carry out his system to its logical conclusion, and give protection to the labour market. The hon. gentleman will protect goods coming into the country because he gets a quid pro quo from those whose interests he protects, but never has the hon. gentleman protected the labourer. He could do that by carrying out the system of excluding foreign labour as he excludes foreign goods, and so allow the Canadian labourer to have an increased price for his day's work. The hon. gentleman from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) talks about this policy giving a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. But where is the fair day's wage? If the hon. gentleman looks at the returns he will see that the operatives in the cotton factories in Nova Scotia receive an average of 65 cents per day. Is that a fair day's wage for a fair day's work? Wages, Mr. Speaker, is a relative term. The amount of wages a man gets does not determine, fully and finally, whether a man is getting a fair day's wage or not. The determining factor is how much he can purchase with his wage. If a man in England on \$1 a day can purchase more of the necessaries of life than can be purchased in a protection country on \$1.50, the wages in England, though nominally lower, are really and actually higher. If you will look again at the book from which I have already quoted, you will find this very question of the English workman dealt with, and you will find the position I take set forth in very clear and specific language:

As regards real incomes, that is, wages or salaries reckoned by their purchasing power, their improvement has, according to Mr. Giffen, been continuous since 1775.

From 1775 to 1815 prices rose, but incomes rose still more.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

R

From 1820 to 1851 prices fell 33 per cent, while incomes remained steady.

From 1851—

When Mr. Gladstone put the cap stone upon the free trade system—

—to 1870 prices rose 26 per cent, but incomes rose 66 per cent.

From 1870 to 1890 prices fell 30 per cent, while incomes rose 40 per cent.

In other words, incomes and wages, reduced by index number to the value which gold had in 1871, were approximately in the proportion:

1820	51
1851	76
1871	100
1890	200

These figures must not be used indiscriminately, they merely state that the average workingman could obtain with his wages in 1890 four times as much as those things which are consumed, food, manufactured goods, &c., as a man in a similar position could in 1820. To my mind, these figures speak volumes. It is not enough for the hon. gentleman simply to point to an increase in the number of men or women in a certain industry receiving the wages they got before or even a nominally slightly higher wage, unless he can show that the wage they get enables them to purchase more of the necessaries of life than did the wages they formerly got. One word more from this work upon this point, as I think it important, and I will pass on:

The benefit of this increase of purchasing power has not been equally distributed; it has come mainly to the working classes and to people with small incomes. Our imports consisting so largely of food, it is those who had to consider every penny expended in housekeeping, who are enriched by the reductions in the price of bread, meat, and rice. Since the era of foreign trade there are hardly any in regular employment so poor that they cannot obtain as much bread as they want of a finer quality than middle-class people at the beginning of the century; meat is no longer a rare luxury among any large class of workmen, as it was fifty years ago; it is only necessary to allude to the reduction in price of tea and sugar, which have done so much respectively to make life endurable for adults and for the healthy nourishment of children. At the same time, a variety of food is possible, which must conduce greatly to the health and pleasure of city life.

Now, Sir, let us consider for a moment why the Liberal party condemn the National Policy. I have spoken of the advantages hon. gentlemen opposite claim for it, now let us see why we condemn it. We condemn it, in the first place, because it is a system which wrings from the people millions of dollars for treasury purposes more than the old tariff did. What is the sense of trying