

hon. friend opposite insisted, if I understood him right, that under the present system trade was continually decreasing; that at the time the former system prevailed, while my hon. friend's Government was in power, the aggregate of the trade of Canada was much larger than it is at the present day. That is what I understood him to say.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I quoted three years which were larger than last year.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I understood my hon. friend to make the assertion in rather a broad form. He quoted certain figures to prove that instead of trade increasing under the National Policy, it was decreasing, and he cited some figure relating to a period when his Government was in power, and compared the present year, I think, disadvantageously with that figure. Of course, my hon. friend did not wish to put in issue exactly the amount of dollars and cents that were imported and exported in any one year. What he wanted to show—the proposition that he laid before the House, as I understood it, and as I think every member of the House understood it, was, in broad terms, that under the National Policy trade had fallen off, that trade was not so good now as when my hon. friend's Government was in power. Now, I am going to look just at two or three figures respecting these aggregate imports and exports but before I do so I would like to remark on one fact, which must be obvious to everybody. The imports of raw material having increased from \$5,000,000 to \$35,000,000, we will say, in round figures, during this period, would naturally account for a great reduction in the importation of manufactured articles. That is plain, it seems to me; it cannot possibly be otherwise, because this raw material is manufactured in this country. If it had not been for its importation and the encouragement of manufactures under the National Policy it would have been imported in the form of manufactured goods. I cannot state what the proportion on the value of goods manufactured from thirty millions of dollars worth of raw material would be, but everyone here can recognize, and will recognize, that the

difference in the value of that raw material as imported and its value after its being manufactured must be very large indeed—I might safely say enormous. I mention that because in examining the figures which show the aggregate imports and exports of this country I am entitled to say that we have derived a benefit in this country—not the manufacturers, as my hon. friend says, in particular, but the whole country—every man who has produce to sell, every man who has hands to work with, every man who can assist in manufactures has derived a benefit from the manufacture of these goods. The increase in the value of these goods is made up, not altogether of the profits to the manufacturer; if these goods are worth three times as much after they are manufactured, say \$100,000,000, my hon. friend does not mean to say that the difference of seventy millions of dollars goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. They get their profits, no doubt, but the main portion of the money goes into the pockets of the people of this country—it goes to support those engaged in the work of manufacturing, to tradesmen of all descriptions, and to build up our towns and villages. That is where the money goes, and we are entitled, in making comparisons such as my hon. friend proposed a few moments ago, to consider how much our present imports would represent if these raw materials had been imported into this country in the form of manufactured goods. This is the only basis upon which a fair comparison can be made. That proposition—and I am certain it is a sound one—is to the disadvantage of the statement of the present imports. Now let us see how my hon. friend's proposition works out. In 1868 the aggregate trade of this country was about \$130,000,000. We will take the two years before my hon. friend's Government came into power. In 1872 it was \$194,000,000; in 1873 it was \$217,000,000. It was in the autumn of that year that my hon. friend's Government came into power, but of course the policy of his Government and the Government preceding it was practically the same in respect to duties on goods. There was no real difference between the two. In 1874, which was the first year that my hon. friend's Government was in power, the amount was the same as it was in