

1878.	
Total imports.....	\$ 93,081,787
Entered for home consumption.....	91,199,577
Not for home consumption.....	\$ 1,882,210
Total exports .....	\$ 79,323,667
Produce of Canada .....	68,158,789
Not produce of Canada.....	\$ 11,164,878
Deduct.....	1,882,210
Error—Ent'd for as home con...\$	9,282,658
1879.	
Total imports.....	\$ 81,964,327
Entered for consumption.....	80,341,608
Not for home consumption.....	\$ 1,622,719
Total exports.....	\$ 71,491,255
Produce of Canada .....	63,135,611
Not produce of Canada.....	\$ 8,351,644
Deduct.....	1,622,719
Error—Ent'd as for home con...\$	6,732,925
Error, 1877.....	\$ 4,083,629
do 1878.....	9,282,668
do 1879.....	6,732,925
Total.....	\$ 20,099,222
Average error for 3 years.....	6,699,740

Now, I challenge the hon. gentleman to verify the figures I have given. And I ask what is to be thought of a gentleman occupying the high position of Minister of Finance, who comes down to Parliament, after carefully preparing his speech, and makes statements of that kind. I do not believe that he made these errors wilfully, but that simply he did not take the trouble of verifying the figures, so anxious was he to come to the conclusion that his National Policy has been productive of this immense advantage to the farmers of Canada. Let us go on a little further. The average error in each of these three years was \$6,699,707; and we know that all these goods must have come from the United States. Taking the other side of the account, and looking to the details of the imports, to find where the mistake has arisen, what do we find? Take the year 1878. The imports of wheat in that year amounted to \$6,510,131 in value, an amount almost exactly corresponding to the hon. gentleman's error. The wheat which was brought into Canada, handled by Canadian merchants, and exported at Montreal, giving work to our shipping, is included in the reductions the hon. gentleman claims credit for. In shutting out this export of \$6,500,000 of wheat which came into Canada and did not enter into competition with Canadian produce at all, he therefore claims that his National Policy gave a market to that extent to our Canadian farmer. I have given \$6,699,000 as accounted for out of this

\$13,800,000, which still leaves about four millions to be accounted for, before I get down to the sum he says he has succeeded in reducing the trade of Canada to in these particular lines—that is \$3,358,000. Where do I find the explanation of that? I look up again to 1878 to find the exports and imports of Canada in these articles. I find that Canada exported to the United States barley, beans, and peas to the value of \$4,401,104, and brought back, with the money that resulted from their sale, corn and cornmeal to the value of \$4,153,281. Now, I think I have reduced the amount down to the point to which the hon. gentleman says the National Policy reduced it. This \$6,500,000 worth of wheat, which came in and gave work to the people of Canada and put money in their pockets, this \$4,000,000 worth of barley, which was profitably exported to the United States and paid for by the corn and cornmeal which Canadians wanted or they would not have purchased it—that is the profitable trade to the country which he, on this side, and McKinley on the other side, shaking hands together, have succeeded in taking from the Dominion and the United States. But the hon. gentleman is responsible for the larger part. He is responsible for the \$6,510,131 worth of wheat which was exported through this country and which, by his policy, he has shut out. The hon. gentleman proposes to protect the farmers. How does he propose to protect them? Is it by making their literature cheaper. Our farmers like to read. In these days there are cheap publications of all the great works, of all the classical works, which have hitherto come into this country at a certain rate of duty. And the hon. gentleman proposes to help to develop the agricultural interests of this country by taxing this literature double what it was taxed before. And so, in this way, everything that the farmer uses is taxed from 20 to 80 per cent, and, as I have already pointed out, his flour, corn, cornmeal, and coal oil are taxed. I have pointed out already the hardships suffered by the people in the Maritime Provinces in these matters. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has pointed out a special grievance with reference to fertilizers. He claims—and I repeat the claim—that the farmers of the Maritime Provinces should have every encouragement possible. The hon. gentlemen might well, therefore, reduce his tariff and make fertilizers free in order to encourage agriculture, which is severely handicapped by the want of profitable markets, and consequently low prices. But the hon. gentleman retains 10 per cent, and the manufacturers as well as the farmers complain of this. And I will tell the hon. gentleman, who seems inclined to treat this matter rather lightly, that both the farmers and the manufacturers complain that he has not put artificial fertilizers on the free list. I have had letters from manufacturers in the Maritime Provinces—which