

chases. It would not be a fair or reasonable argument for hon. gentlemen to use in favor of an excess of imports, that in the case of Great Britain her imports were greater than her exports, because they are large consumers and not producers in the sense of producers of a food supply and of raw material. To compare that state of things with the position in a new country like Canada is not only unfair but unjust. Dividing that difference of \$125,752,782 by the five years, we obtain a sum of \$25,150,556 as the excess of imports over exports annually during those five years. Hon. gentlemen say we had failures in crops during that period. Grant for the sake of argument that we had one or two short harvests, although I will not admit it and am prepared to prove that it is not correct. Were they shorter than the harvest of 1883, or were they as bad? Let hon. gentlemen refer to the Trade and Navigation Returns, and they will find I am within the mark when I say we did not export one million dollars worth of wheat from the country in that year. Let us take the period from 1879 to 1884 when this party came into power and the present leader took the responsibilities of Government on his shoulders. During those five years we imported goods to the value of \$587,702,151, and the value of our exports was \$548,323,039, the difference being \$39,379,112, and dividing it by six leaves an average of \$6,563,171 per annum. Compare that with the operations of that extraordinary policy pursued by the party now in Opposition and let the people of Canada judge; and if they can believe that, under the policy pursued by hon. gentleman opposite, they can become wealthy, then I wonder the people have not placed them in power before this. I now come to a very important part of the imports from 1874 to 1878. Hon. gentleman opposite may be charged with this folly, that they permitted goods to the value of no less than \$182,307,627 to come in duty free. They may say that this was a wise policy, and one which the people supported. I deny it. The public verdict was given on that policy in 1878. The farmers and manufacturers of Canada demanded a different policy, and I regret that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have not yet learned to accept the verdict of the people but will follow their own theories and fallacies. Let us investigate that amount of \$182,000,000 of free imports and see of what it is composed. During those five years, I repeat, goods to the value of \$182,207,657 were admitted free, and those were for home consumption (I have been careful about that) and were largely composed of items that were being produced in this country by the hardest working part of our population. Let me give the House some idea of what those articles were. Will the House believe that the party in Opposition to-day were so fully committed to their foolish policy as to permit wheat to the value of \$33,995,349 to come in duty free. Did that mean nothing to the farmers of Canada? Was that of no importance to the people? Did we require that wheat? Not at all; and I am talking only of that which was imported for home consumption. That, Sir, was the amount which they have allowed to come in free in five years. We will take the item of flour, not only a product of the farm, but a product of the manufactory, a product of the mill, and what do we find that their folly led them to do? It led them to allow \$12,388,485 worth of that product to come in free; of corn and meal there was \$15,285,929 came in free; of all other grains there were \$3,429,064—making a total of \$65,098,827 of products of the farm which came into this country in those five years, and which must to that extent have driven out the products of our own farmers. Is that giving the people of Canada their home market? Is that the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite would follow to-morrow if they came into power—to give up their home market to their near neighbors and allow our own people to be driven out of their own market to a foreign market, and take their

Mr. HESSON.

chances there at whatever prices they might get? I was always led to believe that the home market was the best market, and the people of Canada, the farmers and laborers of Canada, believe to-day it is the best market. They believe that it is better that they should find employment at home and a market at home for the products of their labor. Now, Sir, it is only fair to hon. gentlemen opposite to compare this showing of the actions of their Government with the condition of things under the present Government. I take the years 1880 to 1884, leaving out 1879 for the reason I have already stated, that the National Policy had not begun in that year to have its proper effect. In those five years, of the goods I have enumerated, there were only \$14,856,685 worth imported, against their sixty-five millions. Take also into consideration the fact that those fourteen million dollars worth of goods were not admitted free, but that we imposed on them a duty of \$1,884,958. Under these circumstances I think I have given an answer to the hon. gentlemen on the question of why the industries of Canada were in an unfortunate and unprosperous condition when they were in power, and why the people cried out with a loud voice, and with almost one accord, "Give us a change of policy." It is only necessary to show that we excluded \$50,212,142 worth of those very products which came in competition with the honest farmers of Canada, or an average of over \$10,000,000 a year to show why the farmers of Canada are in favor of the present policy. It was only taking a leaf from the chapter of hon. gentlemen opposite, or at all events a chapter from the history of the Opposition party, when they advised the Lower Provinces that they should trade with their American neighbors because they were nearer to them. Is that what we expected from the Confederation when we entered in 1867? Is that the policy which we supposed the Federal Parliament of Canada would adopt? I am glad to say that even from the Eastern Provinces comes the cry for more of that inter-provincial trade. What was the object of the investigation of that committee which was appointed in this House but a year ago, headed, I believe, by an hon. gentleman from the Lower Provinces, Mr. Paint? Was not the object of that committee, if possible, to encourage and foster that inter-provincial trade to a greater extent? The policy of the Reform party would be to do away with all that and to trade with our neighbors. I say, first give us control of our own markets; put us on an equal footing with our neighbors, and then we are free to say to them on equal terms that we will open our markets to them when they open their markets to us. The policy of the Reform party never would have given us access to the American markets and never will; we cannot ask them to open their doors to us unless we have something to give them in return for what we ask. I must ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I speak on this question, and put some facts on record, so that it may be known to the people of Canada what the imports of these farm products were from the United States for home use during the past year. They were as follows:—

1884.		Duty.
Barley.....	\$ 13,168	\$ 4,214
Beans.....	29,820	2,317
Corn.....	1,277,131	171,772
Oats.....	27,751	4,458
Wheat.....	292,033	44,799
Flour.....	2,439,999	265,594
Mill feed.....	292,033	51,455
All other grain.....	168,750	16,511
Totals.....	\$4,529,685	\$541,120

I ask the hon. gentlemen opposite if the farmers of Canada are any worse by that duty being imposed and collected? I ask them if the price of grain has been so enhanced by it that poor men have not been able to buy the wherewithal to