

without obstruction with every nation of the world. Her population has increased, her army has increased, her navy has increased, there is progress on every hand. On the other hand, we see countries like the United States, which show many evidences of prosperity for a time; then we heard about thousands of her people being out of employment and armies of tramps, and industrial depression, all because of protection. This trouble overtook them when the time came for them to pay back some of the money they had borrowed. Our hon. friends opposite like the appearance of protection, but they do not like its effect. We hope to see better things in this country when it shall have abandoned the protective system. We have heard a good deal about our credit being good. Well, Sir, we can join with hon. gentlemen opposite in congratulating ourselves that our credit is good. But it is not a wise plan to stretch our credit to the utmost limit. We should not do like the old farmer who only began to curtail his expenses after the farm was gone. It is best to take a look ahead of us before it is too late. I do not think that any country can become permanently prosperous upon borrowed money. Things may run smoothly while the expenditure is going on, but there will come a pay day when we shall have to pay the money we have borrowed. Looking over the Public Accounts, we see there has been an increase in the public debt of \$4,500,000 since last session. There were subsidies voted during the dying hours of that session, when members were preparing to return to their homes, to the enormous sum of \$4,661,000. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated there are about twenty millions of obligations to pay under this head. That being the case, the outlook is serious. It will be remembered that last year a large deputation visited Ottawa and interviewed the Government with respect to the improvement of the Trent Valley Canal. Members of the deputation made full representations to the Government, and explained that they approved the Government's policy. Some of the Ministers replied that they would require something more than moral support. I suppose that was the reason that, notwithstanding the failure of the canal to the present time, a contract has been given amounting to \$429,000, for further works. The expenditure on construction prior to confederation (1867) was \$309,371.31; ditto from 30th June, 1879, to 30th June, 1893, \$1,079,112.56; from 30th June, 1893, to 1st March, 1894, \$3,382.32; total, \$1,391,822.19. Cost of maintenance, 1892-93, \$12,926.07; cost of staff, 1892-93, \$3,739.86. Total revenue, 1892-93, \$888.95. During the last two years, the amount of expenditure on the canal and charges to management was \$8,822, as compared with the small revenue

Mr. SEMPLE.

of \$2,175. These facts show that the expenditure is unnecessary and not in the best interests of the country. They have also another important canal, the Tay Canal, the cost of construction of which amounted to \$476,000. During the last two years the receipts reached \$262.70, they being \$126.94 in one year, and in the following \$135.76. During these two years no less than \$5,000 were expended for repairs and cost of management. In regard to bonuses to railways, \$4,661,160 are to be spent over the country. When we bear in mind that other subsidies were expended, and an instance is known where a president who received large subsidies gave to an election fund \$25,000, it is evident that something was expected from the large expenditure voted last session. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in the course of this debate, have declared that the United States afford no market for our agricultural products. If hon. gentlemen opposite will, however, study the official returns they will find that there is an excellent market in the neighbouring republic, and they will learn that our farmers are of the opinion that it is the most profitable market available. A return covering twenty years, shows a larger amount of trade between Canada and the United States in eight years than between Canada and Great Britain; and for the other twelve years the trade was greatest with Great Britain. In 1889, trade between Canada and the United States was within 11 millions of the whole amount of trade between the Dominion and the rest of the world. That occurred the year before the McKinley tariff came into force. I have heard hon. members opposite declare that the people of Great Britain wanted a protective tariff, and they have cheered such statements made in this House. How can it be supposed that the people of Canada would like a protective tariff in Great Britain as they found it in the United States.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. What had the farmers of Canada to do with the McKinley tariff?

Mr. SEMPLE. If a protective policy was adopted in England, it would be on similar lines, and the farmers would not favour protection. The farmers of Canada were injured by the McKinley tariff, and they would not like to be injuriously effected by having a McKinley tariff both in the States and Great Britain. To those who say there is not a market for the farmers of Canada in the United States, I would say, consult the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1894. For the benefit of those hon. members who think so, I will read to the House figures to show the products of farmers that find their best market in the United States, and returns to show the products of the farmer which finds in Great Britain the most profitable market: