

United States surplus products were brought into the country comparatively free of duty. Now, I find that the total trade of Canada in 1893 was \$247,638,620, which was about \$6,000,000 larger than it has been at any other period. As I said before, that surplus over and above last year does not indicate that our country is retrograding in the slightest. On the contrary, considering the reduction is only in values, not in volume, because the quantity was larger, it indicates that it is prospering, and I also find that the export of agricultural products in 1893 was over \$22,000,000, whilst in last year it was only \$17,677,000 which shrinkage is entirely owing to the depression in foreign countries which have not the means of purchasing as largely as they did, and pay the prices which prevailed in 1893. The decline is simply in value, not in quantity, and our showing is comparatively greater than what can be made by the United States. The falling off in this instance is simply in the foreign markets. The depression in other countries prevents them from buying. Take the fish industry for example. Our fishery products are as large as ever, but what about the prices? They have fallen off one-half and in consequence of the market being so low they have realized nothing and our fishermen are practically worth less than when they started on their perilous voyages in the spring. It is simply the consequence of the people not being able to purchase our products. Had there been no protection what would have been the result? We would not have had the control of our own markets but we would have had all the old productions of other countries, and especially United States products to contend with. Instead of that we control our own market, which is the best market for the farmers of the country. It is a protection which we give them and the more we extend our manufacturing industries the greater will be the market for the farmers. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition argues that the best way to get rid of deficits was to reduce the tariff one-half. I thought it was rather paradoxical to claim that by reducing the tariff you get a larger revenue. With all the economy they can display, and every advantage taken, our people can just simply exist. They are making no money. The tariff was lowered here a year ago just as low as it possibly could be to keep the home market for our own indus-

tries, and if you were to take off one half, the result would be just what my hon. friend desires, it would destroy every manufacturer in the country, and we would have to rely upon the products of our farmers and lumbermen to sustain the country. He then spoke about the fisherman being taxed. I do not know whether fishermen are taxed more than others, but if my hon. friend's free trade policy came in they would have no protection. Certainly the bounty system is the highest protection. If you come under a free trade tariff, free trade as in England, why the first thing that would have to go would be the bounties to the fishermen. They are protected and in many things free from duty. Then with regard to the woollen industry it has been considered for the benefit of the fishermen whilst my hon. friend knows that woollen goods are cheaper here to-day than in the United States. They can undersell us in cottons but not in woollens. In the United States they get from us our woollen goods because we can make the woollen goods, which the fishermen use, much cheaper in Canada than in any other country, less the duty. Now what about this free trade matter? We had the tariff before us last year for revision. The Finance Minister well knows how many men approached him from Grit constituencies asking for protection in their particular industries? I know that in Yarmouth, there is an industry employing a large number of hands. The government was impertinent to increase the protection to that industry. Then we know how anxious many were to have the tariff on petroleum reduced, and that could not be done because of the petroleum interest in western Ontario in a grit constituency. If you go all over Canada you will find wherever there is an industry in the country the Grits there want it protected. A few months ago these Grits feared that there would be a general election, and wherever the leader of the opposition and his colleagues went they suited what they had to say to the wishes of the people of that province. Down in Nova Scotia they said nothing against the iron or the coal industry, but when in the west all those industries had to be destroyed. Down with us! It was the milling industry which was to come down, and we were to have cheap flour. Along the international line they should have reciprocity and down in Montreal they said they would not injure the manufacturing industries of the country at all. In every place they went they had an ar-