

rial which my hon. friend on my right says is of so much advantage to the country. I do not rise to argue the destruction of the commercial interests of Canada; if I thought that what I advocate was going to destroy the manufacturing power of the country. I would hesitate to raise my voice towards that result. I wish to impress upon my hon. friend on my right that the exporting power of the country requires no protection, whether our export be of cheese, butter, wheat, boots and shoes, sugar or anything else. Any exporting power that we possess requires no protection. It is the exporting power of the country that is the measure of its wealth, and that exporting power is regulated by the cheapness of production which is artificially increased by the protective tariff. I wish to show this honourable House the figures presented to us by the census in regard to manufactures, and which is the basis of argument by protectionists through the country, in defence of protection from their standpoint. What are those figures? They are that the capital invested in the manufacturing interests of Canada is \$354,000,000; that the wages paid out in manufacturing in this country amount to \$100,000,000: that the money paid out for raw material in conducting the manufactures of the country is \$250,000,000, and the value of the articles produced \$476,000,000. That is very good if it does not increase the burden of taxation on the people in consequence of the policy that brings it out.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B. C.)—Are those annual amounts?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—These are compiled from the census of 1891. The figures relate to that year, and to that year only. Of course, you can only get those figures by the census.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B. C.)—The production of the manufacturers that year was \$476,000,000.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—Yes. Their value returned by the manufacturers to the census commissioner.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD—Then, all that was kept in the country?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I wish to show at what expense it has been kept in the

country, if your idea is that without protection they would leave the country which idea I challenge. That is my object in quoting the figures. These are the figures put in our hands—the figures by which the government justifies the infliction of protection and the continuance of protection. I wish to show that the government is not justified in any degree in continuing protection—that so far as those figures show it is not to the advantage of the country. I wish to show you the difference between the cost of the manufacturing that is there shown by the figures, and the value of the articles produced as shown by the census. The capital invested in manufacturing is \$350,000,000, 10 per cent on that is \$35,000,000. One-half of the capital is called working capital; the other half is called fixed capital—that is, capital invested in lands, buildings and plant. The working capital is what you may call banking capital used for paying wages, buying material, etc. Ten per cent interest on that amount of capital, is a very fair earning power for the capital invested. In addition to that we have \$100,000,000 paid out in wages, and in addition to that \$256,000,000 paid out for raw material. I say \$35,400,000 interest on capital which is the share that capital gets in the manufacturing and \$100,000,000 which is the share wages gets, and \$256,000,000 which is the share raw material gets in these manufactures, the addition of interest on capital, wages and material, should show the cost of manufacturing. If there is anything else there is no detail of any other cost to the manufacturer given. But there is a column which shows the value of the articles produced, and that is \$476,000,000. The difference between the three items which go to show the cost of manufacturing these articles in Canada and the value of the articles produced, according to the census returns, is \$84,000,000. That \$84,000,000 has to be borne in consequence of the duty that is imposed for the purpose of protecting those manufacturers—or in other words 25 per cent represents the \$84,000,000 added to the cost of manufacturing 25 per cent represents the duty that is imposed for the protection of those manufactures. In this \$476,000,000 the retail selling price is not represented, wholesale men purchase from the factory or rather manufacturers, wholesale agencies charge enough to the retail trade