

one. I have no intention to answer the long arguments of the hon. gentlemen from St. John and Albert. Whenever they approached the question at issue what course did they pursue? They merely tried to asperse the reports of the commissioners, but they have failed to show in what respect they were defective. Even the hon. member from Albert had to pay a tribute of respect to the commissioner for New Brunswick. He could only discover a typographical error, which was apparent to everyone. The New Brunswick commissioner gives both sides of the question, and makes a statement which may, therefore, be taken as more credible than if it had been a party report altogether. The hon. gentleman from New Brunswick said that the National Policy was driving the young people from that province, because their trade relations were hampered. How can that be the case if there are more people employed in 1884 than there was in 1878? It shows that there is more employment in the country, and if young men are leaving the province, it is from other causes than the National Policy. The hon. member from Albert says that the National Policy interferes with the farmers. I deny that it does. Nearly all the goods that our farmers use are manufactured in the country; so that the National Policy can in no way interfere with them, unless it is to benefit them, because it gives them a larger home market than they formerly had, on account of there being more people employed and getting higher wages in the different manufacturing establishments, than they did formerly. Hon. gentlemen laid great stress on the duty on flour and Indian corn brought into the country. What does that duty amount to? One-fifth of a cent on the pound for Indian corn. Suppose a family were to use 5 pounds in a day, the duty upon that would be only 1 cent a day. The duty on flour is a quarter of a cent per pound, and these are the infinitesimal taxes to which he has referred as grinding down the people. He says that trade should be conducted on the old lines. The old lines have fallen to pieces. From 1873 to 1879 the trade of the country was ruined. There was a howl of despair all over the country, and new

lines of trade had to be originated. A new line was struck out and has brought prosperity. Hon. gentlemen have not been able to say that the National Policy has not succeeded. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Haythorne) did not contend that at all. He did not say that the country was not more prosperous. He could not say so, and, therefore, he wisely let it alone. He confined himself chiefly to a long dissertation on abstract questions. The hon. gentleman from New Brunswick made a great handle of the increased prices of manufactured articles up in the North-West. As a matter of course that must be the case. The transportation to that country must add to the cost of those articles, and if they are dearer than in Ontario and Quebec, which are nearer hand, it is only what we must expect as a matter of trade. The hon. gentleman from New Brunswick also said when arguments failed that we remarked we have the people with us. We are proud to have them with us; they have twice over ratified the policy of the Government and have sustained the National Policy. If the hon. gentleman had that argument on his side what would he say? What has he brought forward when argument failed him? He has brought forward two or three letters from obscure fishermen; he has taken the statements of different people in the United States and other parts of the world; he has read history 55 years old about the trade of England; he has told us about the low prices of sugar, coffee and tallow in England, and he has quoted from speeches made by free traders in the United States, and speeches made in Toronto many years ago which have nothing whatever to do with the question at issue. Our contention is that the trade of the country has increased and improved in every way, comparing 1884 with 1878; that was the question that was brought before the Senate. Now we will take the revenue derived from New Brunswick during the five years from 1875 to 1879 and the five years from 1880 to 1884. The figures show a wonderful evenness over the whole ten years. The difference amounts to about \$84,000 a year for the last five years. From 1875 to 1879 the duties collected were \$6,066,274, and from 1880 to 1884 \$6,489,056.