

much saved to the country and a diminution of the imports. So with reference to all the manufactures in the country and their products. If these goods had not been made in the country they would have been imported, and we ask you, considering the prosperity of the country last year, and as a consequence large importations, whether, if we had not the Tariff by which we have been able to produce by these industries, \$16,000,000 a year more than we produced in 1879, the balance would not have been larger against us than it is? I hold that a policy which, if it does not increase the exports, will diminish the imports, must have the effects of bringing the exports and imports nearer together than would have another and opposite policy. I ask whether this has not been sustained by these facts? I have dealt with the leading objections down to the present time, that have been made against the policy adopted in 1879, and I think that the answers I have given, taken from the returns and other public documents, are sufficient, and the subject needs no further remarks from me. But there are some new objections which have been made lately. One new charge brought against the Government in the last twelve months is that they have neglected the interests of the country by legislating in such a way as to change the legislation in the United States with reference to the duty on malt, and thus injuring the people of Canada. Why it is well known that for the last seven years, there has been a conflict in the United States between the maltsters and the brewers. The maltsters have been endeavouring to obtain an increased duty and to shut out the malt from Canada. They failed in their endeavours until the last Session of Congress when they gained a victory over the brewers and obtained an increased duty on malt. By that operation, they have shut out a very considerable export of malt from Canada to the United States during the last year. It is quite true that a concession on the other hand was made which really is a benefit to our farmers, though limited, by taking 5 cents per bushel off the duty on barley. We are told the Government of Canada is responsible for this. Let me read an extract from a speech made by Sir Richard Cartwright at Lennox some three or four months ago :

"Some gentlemen present know to their cost that although it was not possible for a Reform Government to add one cent to the value of their barley——"

That is declared by a gentleman who was in the late Government.

"That a Finance Minister who did not understand his business, and would persist in acting on his own advice, contrary to that of able men around him——"