

to the extent of the tariff for the local market, but do no injustice to any class and recognize the conditions of the country. And so the tariff was lowered.

What result has it accomplished, judged by its fruits? \$249,000,000 of trade with all the other nations of the world under their protective tariff, and under our revised tariff, \$640,000,000. Has not trade been made freer? Has the tariff not been reduced? In all the hundreds of items that were in their general tariff, scores of them were reduced in rate, and only, I think, four articles were raised in a slight degree in the general tariff. One-third of that amount was deducted from all the tens of millions of imports that came from the mother country into this country. Sir, what has been the result? Trade from England has doubled, enriching the producers of this country. Freer trade? Yes, three times the trade that we had before. If based on the protective principle you would not have had it, if the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite had been carried out. These imports are increasing, they are an injury to the country, they say, pass a law, raise your tariff and shut them out. We did what the platform told us to do, we lowered the tariff. We had consideration for the different industries of the country, we promoted freer trade, we have accomplished it with Great Britain to a marvellous extent. We tried to get reciprocity with the United States, they were not ready to concede it, and it takes two to make a bargain. We are not dependent upon them, we might have benefited by reciprocity, and so might they. But when it came to the point that we had to agree to their proposition with reference to the Alaska boundary before we could negotiate on trade matters, we were unable to go further, and the negotiations were broken off. So trade remains as it was

before, with this exception, that in common with the imports from all other countries there has been a proportionate reduction on many goods coming from the United States, a reduction in the interest of the people of Canada. Trade has been made freer with them than it was before, and to the benefit of the people of this country.

So I go through the different planks of the platform. Hon. gentlemen remind us that we 'viewed with alarm the increase in the public debt, and in the annual expenditure.' So we did at the time the platform was adopted, when the government were not getting revenue enough to pay the ordinary expenses of administration, to say nothing of the interest account that had to be met. We put an end to that by reducing the rate of taxation and making trade freer, with all its enriching consequences. The imports increased, money flowed into the treasury to such an extent that we were able to expend \$127,000,000 on public works. Another plank was the liquor question. But we did not get prohibition into effect they say, it was not in the platform that it should be put into effect. The minds of the people had to be ascertained first, and the question then considered. Land for the settler was another plank. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, Ah, there is another of your planks gone. The land for the settler? Yes, sneer as they like and jibe as they like in an endeavour to make people believe that is not the case. They talk about the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. But you know that the cardinal principle of that sale was that these men were bound to put settlers on the land. Did they? They could not have got it otherwise. So the land was for the settler, even in that case. Land for the settler—how has that plank been carried out? Hear the record for ten years: