

that was made in the United States. He stated that at the close of the civil war the United States had a debt of \$2,500,000,000, or \$69 per head of population while now it was only \$25.39 per head, and he said that the people of that country had made all this great progress since the close of the war. But, when the hon. gentleman from King's, to whom he was referring, stated that they had nothing to show for the debt at the close of the war, he said they had four or five millions of negroes to show. Everyone knew that. Everyone knew that the great struggle between the north and south was over the question of the negro slaves, and every humane and benevolent man in every civilised country in the world was glad to find that the result of the war was the freedom of those people, and that men should cease, in North America at least, to trade in the blood and flesh of each other. But that was a war of destruction. The hon. member for King's was perfectly correct. It was a war of destruction, and they had nothing to show but the negroes, and what to do with them was absorbing the attention of statesmen in the United States at that time. That war not only brought desolation and misery to thousands of firesides, but destroyed millions of property, and Sherman's march to the sea itself laid waste more property than would build two Canadian Pacific Railways. But if the great progress to which the hon. gentlemen referred did take place, what was the cause of it? Did the Americans, at the close of their war, adopt the policy of free trade? No; they adopted the opposite policy. They found they had five millions of negroes on their hands, and they found it necessary, in order that they might provide employment for these negroes, to adopt a policy which would create industries and give employment to these people; and the result of that policy has been that the United States has progressed so much that the debt is almost wiped out, and that the progress is going on day by day. And, though hon. gentlemen opposite may say that because the Democratic party has got into power they are going to adopt a different policy, we know from all sources of information that that is not the case, and that the American people are wedded to the system of protection to American industries, and will not give it up. The hon. gentleman was not satisfied with making an unfavorable comparison between Canada and the United States, but he also made a comparison between England and Canada. It is manifestly unfair to make a comparison between an old country like England and a young country like Canada. We are all proud of old England; we are proud of being a loyal dependency, if I may say so, of that great country; we are proud that our nation places us under the protection of its flag; we are proud of the great energy and enterprise of the British people, and of the way they have carried their commerce on every sea of the world; but while we are proud of England we must also be proud of Canada. Canada is our home, Canada is where we expect to live, and while we love the old country we should love Canada more. The hon. gentleman makes a comparison between the trade of England and Canada. I deprecate the action of an hon. gentleman who professes to be patriotic, and in making a comparison, distorts the figures, for the purpose of making his own country appear in a bad condition as compared with the country to which he is referring. He says:

"We find that the volume of our trade to-day is not as great as it was in 1873. In 1873 the volume of our trade was \$217,000,000; to-day, instead of its having advanced by leaps and bounds, as we had a right to expect, and as I do not hesitate to say it would have had there been ordinary prudence exercised in the management of affairs in the North-West, had there not been reckless extravagance shown in the administration of our affairs, the volume of our trade is but \$207,873,000."

Then he went on to say:

"I find that in 1867 the total trade of England was £501,000,000. In 1881, instead of remaining stationary, as ours had done, the total trade had gone up to £720,000,000."

Now do you not see the injustice of that comparison? He takes from 1873 to 1884, eleven years of Canada, and compares it with sixteen years in England, and because the sixteen years of English trade has shown a greater increase than the eleven years of Canadian trade, he says we are not making as great progress as they are. This is the way in which he distorts his figures. To show what the trade of Canada is, and to make a fair comparison, I will take it from 1873; and give ten years. The aggregate trade of Canada in 1873 was \$217,801,203; in 1883 it was \$230,339,826, or an increase of \$12,538,623 in the ten years. That is quite different from the statement made by the hon. gentleman. He took one of our best years in the past and compared it with one of our worst years at present, and he took one of the worst years of England in the past and one of the best years at present, in order to make it look as bad as possible for Canada. But, if we look at the exports of the country, which are more important in this connection than the aggregate trade, we find that the exports of the products of Canada in 1873 amounted to \$89,789,922, and in 1883 to \$98,085,804, an increase in our exports of \$9,295,882, or a yearly increase of nearly a million dollars. The imports of England in 1873 amounted to £371,287,372, and the exports to £255,164,603, the exports and imports together making a total of £626,451,975. In 1883 the imports were £426,891,571, and the exports £239,799,473, making a total of £666,691,044, showing an increase in 1883 over 1873 of £40,239,069. But, while the total trade had increased, the exports had decreased. In 1873 they amounted to £255,164,603, and in 1883 to £239,799,473, or a decrease in the ten years of £15,365,130, as compared with an increase in Canada during the same period of about \$10,000,000. This is quite a different statement from that of the hon. gentleman, but it is a correct statement, and it is the only way in which you can apply a fair test to the trade of the two countries. But the gist of the hon. gentleman's argument was to prove that our trade had fallen off under the National Policy; that is what he was driving at all the time, and to show that he was quite incorrect in his statement and that the trade of Canada has advanced under the National Policy, I will take the five years of the Mackenzie Government and five years of this Government, and compare the two. The figures are these:

<i>Mackenzie Government.</i>	
Aggregate trade, 1874 .....	\$117,565,510
do 1875 .....	200,957,262
do 1876.....	174,176,681
do 1877.....	175,203,355
do 1878.....	172,405,454
Total .....	<u>\$940,308,362</u>

<i>Present Government.</i>	
Aggregate trade, 1880 .....	\$174,401,205
do 1881 .....	203,621,683
do 1882 .....	221,556,703
do 1883.....	230,339,826
do 1884.....	207,803,539
Total.....	<u>\$1,037,712,936</u> 940,308,362

This shows an increase of trade amounting to ..... \$97,404,574

under the National Policy, in four years, or an annual average increase of \$19,480,905. This, I think, is a fair way to state the trade of Canada and to place its condition before the countries of the world, and not the way in which the hon. gentleman from Queen's has done it. But the hon. gentleman was not satisfied with comparing the trade of Canada with the trade of England and placing our trade in as unfavorable a position as possible, in comparison with the trade of the old country, but he made a comparison of the workmen of Canada with the workmen of