

Was there ever a more complete demonstration as to the difference between promise and performance? Could there be any official figures showing a more complete failure on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to carry out the promises they made to the country, to carry out the honest, fair and reasonable expectations of the people.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, hon. gentlemen opposite from time to time, speak of the progress and advancement of this Dominion. These statements remind me of a story told of a darkey during the Southern war. He was a servant of a colonel in the Southern army, and when he came from the front he was asked how things looked there. He said: "I don't want to demoralize our people; but I can tell you our army is advancing backwards and the enemy is retreating forward." We can apply that to the hon. gentlemen opposite. In all their trade and financial experiments, they are advancing backwards. Now, Sir, in contrast to that, we have the plain simple declaration representing the views and aspirations of the Liberal party. We have not merely the declaration itself, but we have it backed up by the whole history of the party, and the whole history of their attempts at relieving the people from the enormous burdens thrown upon them by the administration of affairs by the Conservative Government.

We have a declaration which favours reciprocity with the United States, a declaration which favours a revenue tariff with the elements of protection taken from it; and, although hon. gentlemen opposite may pretend that they do not know what a revenue tariff means, every gentleman on this side of the House can tell them. It means, in the first place, a just and honest tariff, it means, in the next place, a low tariff. It implies a reduced expenditure, it implies fair and equitable adjustment of the burdens which must be borne by the people, and it implies an honest and economical administration of the affairs of the country. It precludes any Administration which shall come into power upon principles of that kind, from throwing away and squandering money, either upon political or commercial favourites. It precludes the idea that the Administration of the day will submit, for one instant, to any of those robberies which have characterized the maladministration of affairs by the present Government.

Under a Liberal Government, there will be no extravagant expenditure, there will be a low, uniform, and just tariff, there will be no Curran bridge steals, there will be no St. Mary's bridge frauds and humbugs, there will be no Sheik's Island Dam business, and no money wasted on Little Rapid Locks. There will be no money thrown away upon contractors under conditions not nominated in the bond, and under conditions unknown to the people of this coun-

Mr. FLINT.

try, but which are well known to those who administer the election funds of the present Government. I trust that when the people of this country see in their full enormity the exactions and burdens laid upon them under the guise of building up a trade and prosperity which does not exist, they will replace this present incompetent Administration by one that will do justice to all classes of the people.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, as this is an interesting debate, I would like to offer a few remarks, and I will try and make them as brief as possible. I will not deal with quite so many figures as my hon. friend (Mr. Flint), and I will confine my remarks as closely as possible to the question before the House. I will first investigate, Sir, the effects of the National Policy, and I shall inquire what its effects are on the prices of farm produce. I shall inquire if the National Policy has increased the price of manufactured goods, I shall inquire if the National Policy has destroyed Canada's credit in the London money market, and I shall inquire, too, if the National Policy has reserved the home market to the people of Canada. If I succeed in showing that the National Policy has not increased the price of manufactured goods, if I succeed in showing that the National Policy has, at least, secured the home market for our farmers, if I succeed in showing that the National Policy has not injured Canada's credit but improved it; then, Sir, I am entitled to claim that the National Policy is deserving of the support of the people of this country. We must presume, in the first place, that the policy of our friends of the Opposition is a tariff for revenue only, or free trade as it is in England, or a tariff without a vestige of protection. That, at all events, is their policy for the time being, although we do not know what it may be in the near future, as it changes very frequently. I shall also try to consider how this tariff bears upon the farmer, the wage-earner, the artisan, and the manufacturer, and I will try to show how the tariff bears on the agriculturists, the largest class in this community. In a speech delivered in Charlottetown in March last by the hon. the senior member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), he tried to make out that the National Policy had no effect on the price of the farmers' produce, that it did not raise the price of his potatoes, or his pork, or his oats, or anything of that kind, and in the course of his remarks, he said:

There was indeed some pork imported into this country, but chiefly for the use of lumbermen.

Now, let us consider, for a moment, this question of pork, and see what the importations to this country have been. In 1891, we find, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the importations of pork and pork products amounted to 22,221,114