

policy we expected that there would be a change, but not to the extent of the duty of 15 cents a bushel imposed on wheat. It was never claimed by the leaders of the Conservative party that the people of Canada were going to get the full benefit of all that protection, but it was claimed that it would give them the home market; and if it was sufficient to shut out the foreign products that came into competition with the products of the farmers of this country, it was sufficient for our purpose. Then, if we did not get the whole 15 cents duty imposed by that policy, I want to show exactly what benefit we did get; and I think I can find that in the commercial columns of the *Globe*. In 1879, the price in Toronto for the best quality of wheat was \$1.31, and in Oswego \$1.35, or 4 cents in favor of Oswego; in 1880, the highest price in Toronto was \$1.16, and \$1.15 in Oswego, being 1 cent in favor of Toronto. Hon. gentlemen opposite are wonderfully surprised at this, but they will find it all in the *Globe*. Every single figure I quote I have taken from the *Globe*, and I challenge hon. gentlemen to deny the accuracy of my figures; nor have I taken them from particular days, but, as I stated before, on a particular week throughout the whole ten years' period. In 1881, the price in Toronto was \$1.29, and in Oswego \$1.39; in 1882, in Toronto it was 92 cents, and in Oswego 97 cents, 5 cents in favor of Oswego; in 1883, Toronto, \$1.16; Oswego, \$1.12, or 4 cents in favor of Toronto; in 1884, Toronto, 74 cents; Oswego, 82 cents, or 8 cents in favor of Oswego. Averaging the price for five years, I find that at Toronto the average was \$1.09½, and in Oswego \$1.16¾, or 7¾ cents in favor of Oswego, under the operation of the National Policy, while, as I have shown you, the price was 33 cents against the farmers of Canada during the period hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. I do not pretend to say that the National Policy did this. It may be we have had better communication with the seaboard, or improved railway accommodation, or there may be other causes, but nevertheless the facts exist and let hon. gentlemen answer them if they can. I will take the price of wheat in Chicago and in Toronto. In 1879, on the 30th December, it was \$1.35 in Chicago and \$1.32 in Toronto. That was the year the National Policy came into operation and before it had time to have its full effect. Compare prices in 1885 between Chicago and Toronto. On the 19th March, 1885, the price in Chicago was 73½ cents and in Toronto 82 cents, or 8½ cents in favor of Toronto; or, adding the 3 cents that stood against Toronto in 1879, the difference in favor of Toronto now compared with the difference then is 11½ cent. I will take another illustration also from the *Globe*. I will compare Montreal with New York. On the 30th December, 1879, the price of wheat in New York was \$1.49 and in Montreal \$1.45, 4 cents in favor of New York; on the 19th March, 1885, the price in New York was 90 cents and in Montreal 93 cents, 3 cents in favor of Montreal; or adding the difference of 4 cents that stood against Montreal when hon. gentleman opposite were in power, the comparison shows 7 cents in favor of Montreal compared with that period. We thus find that in Montreal which is, I might almost say, the capital of Canada, we have the best market to-day that there is on the continent; and beyond doubt, a large portion of this improvement is due to the beneficial effect of the National Policy on the farming interests of the country. The hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) in discussing this question the other day, referred to the Government savings banks; and it will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that he stated those banks were upheld, not by the working people of Canada, but by its wealthy men, by its business and professional men. He said it was the business men and the professional men who took advantage of the Government savings banks and the

Mr. HESSON.

post office savings banks. I would like to see if that is correct.

Mr. DAVIES. I did not refer to the post office savings banks because we have not got them in the Maritime Provinces. I referred to the Government savings banks.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was the Government savings banks that you asked for and argued on.

Mr. DAVIES. But not the post office savings banks.

Mr. HESSON. I find that in 1874 the total deposits in the Government savings banks were \$3,466,136; in 1878 they were \$5,526,955, or an average increase of \$500,000 a year. Now, since the introduction of the National Policy, since the country has rid itself of the Grit incubus of ruin and decay, what do we find? We find that the average increase during the period this Government has been in power has been at the rate of over \$2,000,000 per year. But a few days ago we had a report published which, I presume, is in the hands of hon. members, showing the deposits on the 31st January, 1885, in the Government savings banks. They are as follows:—

Toronto .....	\$ 789,050
Manitoba .....	671,461
British Columbia.....	2,199,319
Nova Scotia.....	7,027,222
New Brunswick.....	4,556,644
Prince Edward Island .....	1,626,896
	\$16,867,532

Deduct the amount of \$5,526,955 at the credit of that fund when hon. gentlemen opposite went out of power in 1878, and you have an increase under this Administration of \$11,340,577. I would say further, that there are in Nova Scotia some twenty-nine of these banks where deposits of that character are made, and in every one of them, with the exception of four, there has been an increase, showing that prosperity is pretty widespread and not confined to the cities, where the business and professional men have to reside. The deposits being so widespread, it is evident they must have come from the great bulk of the people and not from any particular section of the people. I think I shall be able to prove, before I leave this subject, not only that the hon. gentlemen are incorrect in their views on that matter, but that they are grossly incorrect. I will take the period when the post office savings bank was established, 1869, with a total deposit of \$356,814. In 1874 that had increased to \$3,207,051. That was the period when the Conservative party left power and the Reform party became responsible for conducting the affairs of the country. From 1874 to 1878, under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, do we find a large increase? Do we find any increase? No, I am sorry to say—because a reference to that period must bring rather unpleasant recollections with it, must bring to some people who discuss these questions, recollections which are altogether unpleasant—instead of there being an increase during the five years of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, there was a decline of no less than \$453,570 in the deposits. What was the effect upon the depositors? The number of depositors in 1874 was 45,329, pretty well distributed over the people, and in 1878 that number had declined to 40,097, or a decline of 5,232 who had ceased to deposit in the post office savings banks of Canada. Now let me come to the period from 1878 to 1885. The total deposits now are \$14,411,857. Deduct the sum at the credit of the savings bank account when the Reform party went out of power, \$2,751,481, and we have an increase during the period of the administration of this Government of \$11,657,376. The number of depositors in 1878 was 40,097; in 1884 it had risen to 100,489, an increase of 60,392. Now, to meet the statement of my hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I., (Mr. Davies), who said it was