

animals and their products, the produce of Canada, \$3,861,906; fisheries, the product of Canada, \$1,454,901; being a total of \$10,556,232 per annum, or \$31,668,695 for the three years. Add to this the fact that in addition of that increase of thirty-one millions odd during the three years I have named our lumber trade with the United States greatly revived, revived to such an extent that our manufacturers last year were receiving for their lumber a higher price in gold than they received during the inflated period of the Civil War, in currency was worth only 40 cents on the dollar; when you add all these facts together you are able to account for the improvement in the times quite clearly and quite satisfactorily, without any reference whatever to the National Policy, or to any other fiscal policy of this or any other Government. My hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), in the course of his remarks, informed the House that the National Policy had stimulated the export of food. We were told, when the policy was introduced, that it would create a home market for our food; we heard nothing about the policy stimulating the export of food. We did hear that manufactures would spring up on all hands, that our consuming population would be largely increased, that a home market would be furnished for the agricultural products of the Dominion, that we would be no longer under the necessity of exporting food; yet hon. gentlemen to-day tell us that a diametrically opposite result has occurred, namely the stimulation of the export trade in the food products of Canada. How is it about this home market? Under what conditions can a home market be created in a country? Was it reasonable to suppose that when promises were made that the National Policy would result in the creation of a home market for the agricultural surplus of Canada. England has a home market; and why? Because of every \$100 worth of textile products manufactured 65 per cent. were exported. She is not prepared to hand over the control of her own market, but she supplies her own wants under the operation of Free Trade, and exports more than one-half of her manufactures. In consequence of being the workshop of the world, she has a home market, and, besides, a market for the surplus productions of other countries. But it is useless to suppose that Canada can secure a home market surplus by supplying its own wants. A country situated as Canada is, with great agricultural resources, can never afford a home market for its own products by simply attempting to manufacture for its own wants. The United States have been endeavoring to secure this home market for twenty years, and with what result. After endeavoring for twenty years to foster their manufacturing industries to such an extent as to create a consuming population that would consume all their food, they exported, in the year 1880, food enough for 25,000,000 people, and Canada exported enough for 1,000,000. The hon. member for Centre Wellington also informed us that the agricultural interests had been benefitted by this policy. In what way? By the creation of this home market which was to absorb all our productions? By the duty upon grain which was to raise the price of grain that much higher? Will any hon. gentleman in this House inform me that the operation of the National Policy, in so far as grain duties are concerned, has conferred any benefit on the farmer? I would like to hear some individual make that assertion. I say no, it has not. In 1878, and a number of years preceding, Canada was presumably a better market for grain than the United States, and a great outcry was raised here against the importation of American grain. In 1878, oats were worth 10 cents and wheat 14 cents more in Toronto than in Chicago. It was clear then that, under the operation of Free Trade, we had a better market for grain than the United States; and at the same time the United States had, for seventeen years, been living under a protective duty on grain. Although they had a protective Tariff they were shipping millions

Mr. CHARLTON.

of bushels to Canada, and, under the operation of Free Trade, the Canadian market was better than the American market. Is this the case to-day? Are oats to-day worth 11 cents more and wheat 14 cents more in Toronto than in Chicago? They are not. Since our present policy has been fairly in operation, there has not been a day when grain was not worth more in the American than in the Canadian market. I see a smile spreading over the countenance of my hon. friend for Niagara. If the hon. gentleman would follow—

Mr. PLUMB. Because we do not get protection.

Mr. CHARLTON. Wheat is worth more in Toledo, Detroit, Oswego and Buffalo than in Toronto. There is not a single grain on the list that is not higher in the American market than in the corresponding Canadian market. Such was not the case in 1878, yet we are told that the operation of the present duties is beneficial to the farmer. It is an insult to the farmer to try and palm off such nonsense upon him, which he does not believe.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 24th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Rainy River Improvement Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Dundee Land and Investment Company, limited.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Tecumseth Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Richelieu Bridge Company.—(Mr. Baker.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Sault Ste Marie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 44) to amend the Act incorporating the Napierville Junction Railway and Quarry Company.—(Mr. Courso.)

Bill (No. 45) to reduce the capital stock of the Ontario Bank and to change the nominal value thereof, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Edison Electric Light Company of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

THE BUDGET.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Speaker, in moving that you leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means, I desire to make the usual financial statement. I may be permitted, Sir, to say that at no period in the history of Canada has a Government met Parliament with the financial condition of the country in the position it is to-day; at no period in the history of Canada has its credit stood so high as it stands to-day; at no period in the history of Canada, possibly, was the country, generally speaking, as prosperous as or more prosperous than it is to-day; and I propose, Sir, in the statements that I am about to submit to the House, to establish that that prosperity is in a great measure dependent upon the policy of