

The exports from Canada that year amounted in value to \$25,775,245. There was a balance against Canada of \$22,856,494. The people of Canada purchased \$22,000,000 from the United States more than the United States purchased from Canada. In my opinion that is a very unfair trade. That was the trade which existed under the revenue tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it was with the view of correcting that unfair condition of things that the tariff was readjusted by the Liberal-Conservative party when they came into power in 1878. Let us now examine the condition at present. In 1894 the imports for home consumption from the United States amounted in value to \$53,034,100, and the exports from Canada to the United States amounted to \$35,809,940. The balance of trade was \$7,224,160. As my hon. friend from Bothwell will observe that balance is unfortunately in favour of the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Very much more than before.

Mr. CAMERON. No, at that time it was \$22,000,000 in their favour; at present it is only \$7,000,000, showing that a fairer trade with the United States has been secured by the National Policy to the extent of \$15,000,000. During the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, the exports from Great Britain amounted in value to \$48,941,539, and the imports amounted to \$37,431,180, leaving a balance of trade in our favour of \$8,510,359. In other words, England purchased from Canada more than Canada purchased from Great Britain to the amount of \$8,510,359. Under the present system—hon. gentlemen opposite may make such use of the figures as they like—I find that the exports to Great Britain were \$68,538,856, and the imports from Great Britain amounted to \$37,510,359. The imports from Great Britain to Canada increased about \$2,000,000 during that period, but our market in England has increased from \$45,941,539 in 1878 to \$68,538,856 in 1894. So that we find after all that England is our best market, and it would be simply puerile in my opinion to argue that the free trade policy of Great Britain would be applicable in any sense to the wants of the Dominion. Great Britain is so situated that to some extent, her industries are protected by the cost of the transportation of goods from other countries into that island. The position there is very different from what we occupy here. The condition of things that exists in England does not exist here, and the laws of tariff that would be adapted to the wants of Great Britain would be ruinous to the best interests of the Dominion. The idea was that the object of the fiscal policy of this Dominion, as contemplated in 1878, was to have a reciprocity of trade in which the advantages to both countries would be as nearly balanced as possible. I am one of those who believe that it is in the interests of the

Mr. DAWSON.

United States to have a National Policy as they have had in that country for many years, and that for the same reason it is equally in the interest of this Dominion, as our industries are to a large extent similar, to have a National Policy also. It would be in the interests of both countries that each would so protect the industries of its own people that general benefit would result. I have therefore no hesitation in saying, as I did on one occasion some years ago, that in my opinion hon. gentlemen opposite will never have an opportunity of crossing the floor of this House unless they abandon the revenue tariff on the line of British free trade in the same manner as they have abandoned commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity and continental free trade.

Mr. DAWSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion negatived.

Mr. DAWSON. The last hon. gentleman who addressed this House, like many others who preceded him, seemed very anxious to clear away the difficulties which may beset the path of the hon. leader of the Opposition when he takes the reins of power. They seem to be anxious for the success of the Liberals when they come to power, and wish to point out in advance the difficulties of raising revenue and all the other difficulties that may have to be met by the leader of the Opposition.

But I will say, as a humble follower of that hon. gentleman, that I have no fear at all for him, and that, without the assistance of our friends opposite, he will himself solve all difficulties when the people, in due course choose to trust the affairs of this Dominion in his hands. This debate, so far as it has proceeded, seems to have made one point very clear at any rate, and that is, where hon. gentlemen opposite are on the National Policy.

For some time past they have been very chary about saying much in favour of the old policy. Some of them have been wont to describe it as a tree decaying and tottering to its fall, from which the rotten branches must be removed; and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat likened it, last year, to a building so fearfully and wonderfully made that if you took one brick away from the structure, it would tumble down about their ears, burying them in a political sense, in its ruins.

Last session we thought they were beginning well in the direction of tariff reform and that something would result; but when the delegations of the highly protected interests began to pour into this city from their palace cars, the policy of tariff reform was abandoned, and now they have drifted back to the old policy under which they have sheltered themselves the last sixteen years. We now know that the National Policy is to be maintained by them, let the cost be