

live? I ask them if they should come into power to-morrow would they dare to take off that duty? I ask them if they would not find it necessary to carry out the wishes of the people by imposing that duty and carry out this policy? Then I say it would be much more honorable to these gentlemen to have ceased this discussion long ago, and accept the position that they would not and dare not remove that duty if they were on this side of the House. I see the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) is now in his place. In the course of the eloquent and able address which he made the other day he told us that this policy had destroyed the West Indian trade. I made a note of this statement at the time because I thought it somewhat a strange statement to be made by an hon. gentleman living down by the sea, one who happens to be in a position to know that his statement was not absolutely correct, if he had only taken the trouble to enquire. I had the Trade and Navigation Returns before me and I ventured to attempt to point out at the time that the hon. gentleman was wrong, but I was called to order by the Speaker, though I think then was the proper time to point out that the hon. gentleman was making a mistake. I have taken the trouble to look into the question, and I find that from 1874 to 1878 the total imports from the West Indies were \$8,394,908. I looked at the items which compose this total and I found that when the Conservative party went out of power the imports from those islands were something more than \$2,000,000 a year, and I found that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was such that it gradually declined year after year, until the last year they were in power it was but a fraction over \$1,000,000. Again the Conservative party came into power, and what is the result of their policy? I will show you exactly what change took place. I find that the imports from the West Indies from 1880 to 1884, were no less than \$18,759,862, or an increase over their period of \$10,354,854; an increase in the five years under the present Government over the five years under their predecessors of \$10,354,854 in our imports from that country. Now, Sir, amongst all the countries the hon. gentleman referred to, he could not have made a more unfortunate selection than the West Indies to show that our foreign trade has been destroyed by the policy of this Government. On that very question, we may go further and consider the condition of our trade with other countries. We believe that the country knows that the policy of this Government has increased our trade with other countries, and has prevented the Americans from being the middlemen to supply us with the products of foreign countries, as was formerly the case. I find that in the five years from 1874 to 1878, our total imports from Belgium were \$1,440,330; we increased them to \$1,939,687 from 1880 to 1884, or an increase of \$499,356. The same increase will be found in our trade with South America. During the five years preceding the departure of hon. gentlemen opposite from power, there was \$1,060,297 imported direct from South America; we have improved that to the extent of \$5,283,377, or an increase in our five years of \$4,177,080. From France we imported during the five years of hon. gentlemen opposite \$8,480,410, and during our five years, \$8,830,850, or an increase of \$350,450. From Germany we imported during their five years, \$2,957,847, which we improved during our five years to the extent of \$6,648,986, an increase of \$3,691,139. Now, Sir, what do we find with regard to our trade with China? During the five years term of hon. gentlemen opposite, our direct imports from China were \$3,633,453; during this Government's five years, from 1880 to 1884, they were \$7,588,742, an increase of \$3,956,289. Then, Sir, come to little Switzerland, and we find that our imports from that country have increased from \$440,214 in their five years to \$1,082,527 in the five years under the Conservative régime. And with regard to the little country Italy, what do we find? That the imports were \$213,015 during their term of five years, and that we

improved them to the extent of \$821,109 during our five years, an increase of \$608,094. Taking our imports from all of these countries and other countries, including those from the West Indies, we find that we have increased our foreign trade during the five years of Conservative Government over the five years of the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite to the extent of no less than \$26,286,269. Now, I give that as an answer to my hon. friend opposite and those who sit behind him, and I think it ought to satisfy them that on that ground at least they have no reason to find fault with the policy of the Government. Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), and I may almost say every gentleman on that side of the House who spoke, declared that the agriculturists of Canada had not obtained the slightest advantage from the policy of the Government. Both the hon. member for North Norfolk and the hon. member for West Elgin dwelt very strongly on this point, and endeavored to show by columns of figures, which are placed on record in the *Hansard*, that the farmers of Canada had suffered rather than improved their condition in consequence of this policy. Let me read what the hon. member for North Norfolk said on that subject:

"As to agricultural productions, it will be found, upon comparison, that never yet, since 1879 has the imposition of grain duties conferred upon the farmers of this country any advantage whatever."

He goes on further to say:

"We have had a tariff which was to afford the farmers of this country protection, and the very utmost claim the hon. gentleman has ever made with regard to the benefit the farmers derived from that tariff was made two Sessions ago, that possibly the farmers were receiving 3 cents per bushel more for wheat than they would if there had been no duties. That is the very utmost advantage that they ever claimed from the operations of the grain duties."

Now, Sir, I am prepared to take up that challenge. I am prepared to prove that hon. gentlemen opposite were wrong years ago when they declared that the National Policy would not have a beneficial effect on the products of the farmers, and that they are wrong to day. They learn nothing, and so gentlemen on this side are compelled to get up again and again and reaffirm what has been or ought to have been established long as a well founded fact. Sir, I have undertaken to go through the reports of the markets of the country for years back—not the Conservative reports, but those in the *Globe*, the author, I might almost claim, if not the finisher, of that party—and what has been the course of prices during those years? If hon. gentlemen dispute any single figure I will simply refer them to that paper, which I believe reports the market prices from day to day as faithfully as any other; although if there was a single point it could make against the policy of the Conservative party, it would no doubt make it in the interest of its own party. The hon. member for West Elgin made a similar comparison of quotations the other day in order to show what the effect of the National Policy ought to be on the price of wheat. I take the market prices at Toronto and Oswego in December of each year, and compare them for two periods of years, and what do we find? In 1874 the price of wheat in Toronto was 94 cts., and in Oswego \$1.36, or 43 cts. in favor of Oswego; in 1875 the price in Toronto was 96 cts., and the price in Oswego \$1.55, or 59 cts. in favor of Oswego; in 1876 the price in Toronto was \$1.28, and in Oswego \$1.50, or 32 cents in favor of Oswego; in 1877 the price in Toronto was \$1.25, and in Oswego \$1.45, or 20 cents in favor of Oswego; in 1878, the last year of that period, the price in Toronto was 85 cents, and in Oswego \$1.09, or 24 cents in favor of Oswego. Now, if we strike an average for that period, we have as the average price in Toronto \$1.05½, and in Oswego \$1.39, or 33½ cents in favor of Oswego market during the period the party of hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, as against the Toronto market. Now, I come to the period during which the Conservative policy was in operation. On the adoption of that