

With those sentiments I am sure there is not a conservative member of this House, nor a conservative in Canada, who will not be heartily and fully in accord. I trust I may be pardoned for these introductory remarks, but I was anxious that these sentiments that had been uttered by different members of the House, and the change which has taken place in their sentiments since they became senators should be put upon record, in order, that at least we may know what their opinions really are. I could not help reflecting upon times gone by when I heard the speech of my hon. friend who moved the address. I fancy that I heard his dulcet tones ringing through the chamber of the House of Commons in denunciation of the national policy and protection, as having brought ruin and misery on every poor man in the country, and on the farmers in particular. But what a change has come over his dream. Why he had nothing but praise for the government and their whole policy, so far as he ventured an opinion. It is true he said that he would not express an opinion upon what might be called the Yukon railway deal, until he had seen the terms of it, but unfortunately for him, the greater part of his half hour's speech was devoted to approving of that of which he said he knew nothing. It is enough for an old politician like himself to know that the party that he follows had enunciated a certain policy and he was prepared to support it. He also, with a good deal of pleasure, referred to the political importance and material prosperity of Canada, referring to the prosperous state of the country and also to the increase in its business, particularly the imports and exports of the country. There is not a man in Canada who does not join hands in rejoicing over any prosperity that may exist, but when, by inference, it is pretended to show that that is the result of the policy of the present Government, then it becomes an assertion which will be doubted by any one who has studied the question. If our exports have increased during the past year from 16,000,000 to 17,000,000 of dollars has that been the result of the policy of this, or any other Government? It has been the result of better harvest in Canada, more particularly in the North-west Territories, and in Manitoba. It has been caused to a great extent by the fact of a scarcity of provisions, more particularly of cereals in other countries. If the present government and its policy are

to be credited with the prosperity which has existed in this particular line, then I suppose they are also responsible for the causes which created the increase in the value of our cereals. There was a famine in India; are they responsible for that? There was a shortage in the crop of the Australian Colonies to such an extent that millions of bushels of grain had to be shipped to that country. The wheat crop in the Argentine Republic was also a failure, and so it was almost over the whole world, except, fortunately, in the Dominion of Canada. That failure in other portions of the world, opened a market for every bushel of grain and every pound of beef that we could send out of the country. Prices rose and we have reaped a benefit thereby. If you look at the trend of trade in this country you will find that it is tending almost entirely towards England. I have pointed out in former addresses to this House how from 1868 up to last year, the percentage of trade from the United States had fallen off, and that there had been a great increase in the export trade to England. The present preferential tariff, as it is called, however, has had this result: while England has furnished a market for all that we could possibly send her, the importations from Great Britain have fallen off over 3 millions of dollars during the last 9 months. Statistics give us these facts, and if that be the case what becomes of this boasted preferential arrangement, which it is said the present government has adopted in order to increase our trade with England and reduce our trade with other sections of the world? Has the tariff been preferential in its character? Is it not precisely what we pointed out it was during the last session of this House? It was denied then by the government that the preference was given to other nations. However, if my recollection serves me right, I must give the late Minister of Justice credit for this: I have no recollection of hearing that hon. gentleman giving an opinion, as Minister of Justice, upon the disputed point as to the effect of the German, Belgian, and other treaties, containing favoured nations clauses. He studiously avoided that, if my memory serves me right. The furthest I heard him go was to say "Our government contends that those treaties do not affect us," and beyond that the hon. gentleman did not go. Great Britain accepted the statement made by the Premier and by other members of the