

ments at a rate of duty cheaper than what is imposed on the raw material that enters into our implements. Sir, let me quote to you one statement made by an American as to the energy and development of that country as our competitor. He said :

Before long Argentina will yet eclipse Chicago as the meat-packing centre of the world.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker, and we are selling those men implements cheaper to-day than we sell them to our own people, and our Government calls that protecting the Canadian farmer. Let me draw your attention, Sir, to another advantage that the farmers of Argentina have over us. I quote from an Englishman who is an ardent advocate of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, as applied to England. I quote from Mr. Howard Vincent, with whom we are all familiar. He speaks of the internal economy of Argentina, and he says :

A paper money now depreciated between 200 and 300 per cent, now secures nearly as much labour and food as it did when it was at or nearly par. The premium on gold is of the greatest advantage to the agriculturists. They pay for their labour, food, and indeed for their holdings, in depreciated paper, and they receive gold for their exported herds and crops. Its reduction will be firmly resisted by them by all possible means, and, if sudden or violent, would entail serious disaster. To the merchant it is different. He has to pay gold for what he imports, and can with difficulty obtain its equivalent in paper when he sells, and people cannot understand why he wants so much more "national" money for his goods than before, and buy sparingly or dispense with the article.

And this is the kind of competition that our Government is encouraging to-day by taking the duty off the implements that we sell to them and putting it on the Canadian farmer who has to compete with them.

In connection with that matter let me draw attention to the methods this Government have adopted for the increase of our trade. Sir Charles Tupper, in 1888, foreshadowed the idea of stimulating our West India trade by subsidizing a line of steamers for that purpose, and in 1890 our present Minister of Finance took a trip down to the West Indies with the aid of his private secretary, and at the cost of nearly \$1,300 spied out the land to see how the trade was. In the following season the Jamaica exhibition was opened and we spent \$22,000 in pushing our products before the people of Jamaica. We sent, as our commissioner, our old friend, whom we all remember and whom we liked to see so well for his genial ways, Mr. Adam Brown, of Hamilton, and spent some \$5,000 for his services and expenses as our agent. In addition to that, we subsidized a line of steamers to develop that trade, to the extent of from \$73,000 to \$97,000 a year for the last four years. What has been the result of all this labour, and this liberal expenditure? Let us compare

the trade with the West Indies in the five years from 1874 to 1878, with the trade which has been developed under this National Policy boom from 1890 to 1894. For the first five years, our average exports were \$3,720,000 per year, whereas, in the latter five years they were \$3,195,000 a year. So that, notwithstanding these subsidies of about \$90,000 a year, we have not created much of a market for Canadian products in the West Indies. But what does the comparison show with regard to our imports from the West Indies? During the five years from 1874 to 1878, our average imports were \$1,678,000 per year, and during the five years from 1890 to 1894, they were \$3,666,000 per year. That was a magnificent development, was it not? We had increased our imports to more than double. But let me draw your attention to a little event that intervened in the interim. We had taken the duty off raw sugar altogether; and if you examine our trade in detail, you will find that great development to be due to that fact, and not to the subsidies given to the line of steamships.

Mr. WELSH. Free trade.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It was free trade as they have it in England applied to sugar—that free trade which hon. gentlemen opposite are so worried over, and which they are so anxious to ascertain the meaning of. On these imports the average duty per year collected, in the first period, was \$646,000; and in the last period, \$687,000; but the average of the last three years, after the duty had been taken off, was only \$293,000; showing that the increased trade was not due to the subsidies, but to the fact that we afforded the West Indies a better market for their sugar by removing the duty. As a result, we have sacrificed about \$400,000 a year of revenue, besides the subsidies of \$90,000, without succeeding in getting a market for one dollar's worth more of Canadian products. What are we doing in regard to the Australian trade that we have heard so much about—another mode in which it is proposed to protect Canada for the Canadians?

The Prime Minister inaugurated the efforts of the Government to develop a trade with Australia by going out there and travelling around on a pleasure trip, which cost us \$2,745. We have also sent an agent to Australia. This Government, it appears, can do nothing to develop a trade anywhere without sending out an agent, and we have Mr. Larke out there, at a salary of \$3,000 and expenses, to look after our interests and develop our business. In addition to that, we are paying \$121,000 a year by way of subsidy for nine trips of steamers between Canada and that country. As a result of these efforts, we are developing a trade with Australia without doubt; but we are not going to be able to send any cotton goods there,