

a very much higher rate of duty on every article that was permitted to come into that country than we do. Now if it is owing to a policy of this kind that the national debt of the United States has been so greatly diminished, may we not fairly infer that it is possible for us also, in pursuing the policy this Government has been pursuing since it came into power, to arrive at such a state of things as that we may also be enabled to reduce our national indebtedness to a large extent? So much for the remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Now I desire to pay some attention to the speech that was made by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Cockburn). My hon. friend became very eloquent the other day upon the injustice we were doing to Great Britain by imposing such a high rate of duty upon the imports from that country. He did not take the trouble, however, to go into the figures. That would have been a dangerous operation for him; but he drew my attention to the fact that on another occasion when this question was under discussion in this House, I had taken the trouble to investigate it somewhat. Now if there is a party in this country specially desirous of remaining attached to Great Britain I think the Conservative party may fairly claim to stand pre-eminently in that position, and any policy that would operate in favor of the United States as against Great Britain would not receive, and could not receive, the endorsement of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Now, Sir, I took the trouble to look into the Trade and Navigation Returns for a few years past, and I find that in 1873 the imports from Great Britain amounted to \$68,522,776. Mr. Speaker, that was the year the Conservative party went out of power, and that was the last year that the imports from Great Britain reached such enormous figure. Our hon. friends opposite came into power, and whilst the total imports of the country did not decline, I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to show that there was not a decline in the import from Great Britain. Why, Sir, they went down by leaps and bounds until the year they left power in 1878, when the imports from Great Britain had decreased until they amounted to only \$37,091,596, as against \$68,522,776 in the year when the Conservative party went out of power. Now, what was the state of our trade with the United States during the term those hon. gentlemen were in power? Did it also decline, or did it decline in the same proportion? If they will investigate those returns carefully, as I have done, they will find that it did not decline, but on the contrary, it increased to a very considerable extent. Now, Mr. Speaker, a question occurs to me here—what length of time would it have required, if that party had remained in power, for our imports from Great Britain to have disappeared altogether, if they had kept on declining in the same ratio? It is very easy matter to make the calculation. It would have required but about six short years, if the decline had kept on in the same ratio, for every dollar's worth of imports from that country to have ceased to appear in Trade and Navigation Returns. Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the imposition of a heavier duty upon imports from Great Britain, allow me to say this: I have taken up the Trade and Navigation Returns, and they exhibit this fact, that the imports from the United States from 1874 to 1878 amounted to \$251,107,385; and the Reform party who were in power at that time collected duties on that sum to the amount of \$20,894,657. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the comparison between that state of things and the state of things existing under the Administration of my right hon. friend, the leader of the present Government? I will take the years from 1880 to 1884. I leave out 1879 for the reason that the policy of the Government had not really began to take effect during that year and it would not be fair to take that year into account in the comparison. But I find that during this Administration from 1880 to 1884, the total imports from the United States amounted to \$217,865,271,

and upon this amount the Conservative Government collected a duty of no less than \$32,839,809, as against the \$20,894,657 collected by the Reform Government on a very much larger amount of imports. Now, Sir, I think that answers pretty well the statements of the hon. gentleman from North Ontario. If my hon. friend is as clever as I give him credit for being, I think he will be able to see that what he stated here does not bear upon it the stamp of truth. It is clear, Sir, in this statement I have made, that upon \$33,000,000 less imports from the United States we have collected about \$12,000,000 more duty. That is the answer. I might, in order to do justice to that state of things, also point to this fact: that during the Administration of the Reform party the total amount of raw cotton imported into this country, from 1874 to 1878, was only 25,641,459 lbs.—that of course was free—whilst during this Administration for a like period, from 1878 to 1882, there were imported 94,038,219 lbs., or a difference in favor of this Administration of 68,397,760 lbs. When that fact is taken into consideration as being a part of the total imports of production under the Conservative Administration, and as the policy of this and of the last Administration was that that being a raw product and not coming into competition with any product in Canada, and it being required in order to carry on the manufacturing industries of this country, it had to be admitted free under the policy of both Governments—you find on the goods imported from Great Britain nothing like so high a proportionate duty has been imposed as on goods imported from the United States under the régime of this Government. While on the question of imports I might as well deal with the question talked of on both sides of the House and referred to particularly by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that of the balance of trade. The balance of trade has been a dangerous question for hon. gentlemen opposite; and let me point out this, that is policy of the Reform party is—and I have heard it stated on every platform where I have had the pleasure of being present,—that the prosperity of a country is best advanced by importing larger quantities of goods than the country exports, and that such a state of things is an evidence of the growth and prosperity of the people. It is all very well if the exports keep pace with imports; it is far better if the exports exceed them; and it should be the policy of a Government to endeavor to equalise and balance those trades. We have evidence on the other side of the border that, by the trade policy the United States has pursued, they have been enabled during a number of years past to annually pile up the balance in favor of exports and against imports, and it is surely the best evidence and the clearest indication of a country becoming wealthy, where a country is a producing and exporting country, that the balance of trade is in favor of their exports. Do hon. gentlemen recognise the fact that the imports being in excess of the exports and the balance being against the country, it is in a dangerous condition? Does it not occur to hon. gentlemen that it is much better for the balance to be on the side of exports rather than on the side of imports? Let us see what the state of things was under hon. gentlemen opposite. From 1873 to 1878 the total imports was of the value of \$529,256,154; exports for the same period, \$403,403,402, a difference against Canada of \$125,752,782. It would occur to any sensible person, I think, that the difference had to be paid for in some way, either that we owed it or it was settled by failures; and it appears to me that that was a very dangerous state of affairs. A great difference exists between a country like Great Britain, which has imports of gold and interest accruing from her loans, and great wealth and prosperity, and a country like our own, which is a borrower and an exporter of gold, and is continually required to pay interest on our loans and our liabilities for foreign pur-