

worth; in 1879, after the National Policy came into force, that sum was reduced down to \$95,786; in 1883, down to \$71,842; and in 1884 down to \$51,317. Why did the hon. gentleman leave out that item unless it was for the purpose of detracting from the condition of prosperity which this country is enjoying? Well, now, I find he has mentioned another insignificant item in respect to importation, and that is the item of stoves. In 1878 the importations amounted to \$59,319 worth, in 1879 to \$34,212, and in 1879 the importations had fallen to \$47,428, but stoves always had a fair protection and have not been so much influenced by the National Policy as other great industries. Is it supposed for a moment that the National Policy was intended to keep out every article that could possibly be manufactured in this country? You cannot secure such a result. It was never contended that it would have such an effect. The people will have their fancy about one article and another article; and although they may generally like and be pleased with what we manufacture here, yet they go over to the other side and they find something which pleases their taste and they import it and use it instead of the Canadian product. The article of sewing machines has been referred to also. No doubt there is a very large importation of these goods into this country, notwithstanding the duty placed upon them. But the fact is the sewing machine industry of the United States has attained such enormous dimensions, and the surplus stock on hand for the last two or three years has been so wonderfully great, that manufacturers, in spite of the duty, are able to send their goods in here to the injury of the manufacturing interests of the Dominion. That, instead of being an argument against the National Policy, is an argument in favor of it; and if the duty on sewing machines is not sufficiently high, it should be increased. But, I submit, even in this respect the hon. gentleman has not given a fair and candid statement, because although in 1883 we imported sewing machines to the value of \$323,197, the value imported in 1884 was only \$226,232. Another very important item which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) referred to, was agricultural implements. He told the House nothing, however, as to how many of them had been imported in 1884. What do we find? In 1879, we imported to the value of \$240,566, and in 1883 the amount was \$583,065. That is true. But the hon. member does not take into account the great rush of settlement that was going on in the North-West at that time, and that American agricultural implement makers were rushing every machine they could possibly turn out into the North-West. The proof of that is, that we find by referring to the tables with respect to Manitoba alone that the value imported there, in 1879, was only \$74,174; in 1883 it had increased to the enormous value of \$363,769, only \$200,000 less than the whole value of agricultural implements imported into Canada. The hon. gentleman, moreover, did not take into account that notice was given at the time the amended tariff was introduced that it would not come into force until the 10th of May. Thus three weeks were allowed Americans to send in agricultural implements, and the value was run up to the large sum of \$363,769. The duty was increased from 25 to 35 per cent. We find there is now no complaints in the North-West of implements being too dear. We know from the reports which come to us that there are thousands of machines lying there waiting to be sold. They are brought down to the lowest price. What is the consequence? In 1884 the total amount imported was of the value of only \$189,966, showing conclusively quite the contrary, I submit, to the hon. gentleman's statement "that the duty does not prevent articles coming into this country." I do not propose to occupy any more time, but I want to refer to one or two items in a general way in order to show how the farming community has benefited in one item of their produc-

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton).

tion since the National Policy has come into force. I refer to cheese. Canada has now attained in England a pre-eminent position for her cheese, and she is outbidding the world not only for quality but for quantity. In 1879 the Canadian cheese product was of the value of \$3,790,300; in 1884, five years afterwards, it had increased to \$7,251,989. I find that the value of cheese in 1878 was nearly half as much as the value of our barley, beans, oats peas and rye, exported from the country. But in 1884 while those coarse grains increased in value to \$8,273,994, yet cheese came up and reached their united value within \$207,131. I will conclude my remarks. I felt it was my duty to take upon myself to contradict the hon. member for Bothwell, who, I regret again, although he knew I was going to answer him, has not thought proper to make his appearance in the House. I will close my remarks by giving hon. gentlemen opposite a piece of advice, which I am quite sure they will act upon, and that is to go on disparaging the country as long as they please, because hon. members in this House understand them and understand what they are driving at, and they may rest assured that the people of the country, outside this House, also understand them. There are very few men who are so unpatriotic as not to know when you set to work to create grievances, or to make small troubles appear great and not give the country credit for that progress it has indisputably made since 1878, and is still making, that those who pursue such a course have a sinister motive, and you may rest assured that when the time comes round and this House is dissolved, and we are all sent back to our constituents to give an account of our stewardship, then hon. gentlemen will meet with the same reward they did in 1878 and 1882 and be returned here again only to enjoy the cold shades of a sunless opposition.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have listened with considerable interest to the address which has just been delivered by the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Robertson). He attempted in his introductory remarks to show that the policy of my esteemed and hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Mackenzie) had the effect of ruining the country. He went on to say that the Finance Minister of that day was a fly in the wheel; that he could not accomplish anything in the country's interest, and that it was only when a change of Government took place that the country began to prosper. Now, I would like to know what is the matter just now. We have not the same prosperity in this country that we had in 1882. We have places now that are complaining seriously of the stringency of money, and people who are complaining seriously of the scarcity of work. We know that there are general complaints of these matters throughout the country. How is this? How is it that hon. gentlemen have not, in accordance with their declared policy, looked after the interests of the country and seen that matters of this kind do not exist? I would like to enquire with regard to the engine works at Kingston. Why is it that under the operation of the benign influence of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite these works are not in full blast, and that people have not got employment in them? Why have they had to leave our soil and go across to the other side to earn money to support their families, which they left behind them in Canada? Why has the National Policy permitted things of this kind to take place? I think the hon. gentleman should have explained why hon. gentlemen opposite have been so far neglectful of their duties, so far recreant to their duty as great financiers and promoters of prosperity, as to allow matters of this kind to exist at the present moment. The hon. gentleman admits that Hamilton did increase in population under the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He does not deny that, but he claims there is a larger increase under the Government which now exists. Why, Sir, Hamilton did a very respectable manufacturing business before there was a