

market for the farmer had not been increased. We know there is no way in which the farmer would be more directly benefitted than by the increase of the home market, which must necessarily be improved for farm products, by the development of the manufacturing industries of the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) made a speech, in which he called attention especially to agricultural products. His arguments have not been answered. He showed, step by step, the increase which had taken place in the price of agricultural produce, and the great benefit the farmers of the Dominion derived from the operation of the Tariff, and, with the home market for perishable articles, was largely increased. Then, my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, or some other hon. member, read from my speech, and criticised my reference to the fact that this year our exports are likely to equal our imports. He also read from my speech in which I pointed out, in 1873, that our imports were considerably in excess of our exports. He read a statement, by which I undertook to show that, from the freights we receive from our ships, and from various other sources, we would make up, to a considerable extent, the difference between the exports and imports, and prevent another financial crisis. I recollect the hon. gentleman, on Thursday, commented on that statement, and said it was absurd to make any reference as between the imports of Canada and those of the United States. The hon. gentleman said that diminished imports meant poverty.

MR. MACKENZIE: I did not say so, I said they might mean poverty, and they often did.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Well, I am glad the hon. gentleman qualified it. Largely diminished consumption would indicate the poverty of a country, but not largely diminished imports. How is it with the United States? Their imports have diminished year by year, until, for the last three years, the exports exceeded the imports by \$250,000,000 a year. That country was not impoverished by that. The people consumed as largely as ever, but she consumed her own manufactures. If she was not consuming as usual, it would be an indication of the poverty of the people. When the hon.

gentlemen opposite are speaking about the terribly destructive character of the National Policy, they point to the haven to which all our people are going. They point to that country that has, so long since, adopted this policy in the interest of their own country—a policy that is leading our people away—a policy that is making that country, at the present moment, more prosperous than it has been for many many years. I would ask hon. gentlemen, when they are referring to this matter, what would have been our position in the Dominion of Canada if we had not adopted a policy that has enabled us to give employment to our industrial classes? They would have had to go abroad for the purpose of seeking employment. It is stated that 23,000 persons have passed over to the United States from Sarnia, but we all know that a large portion of them belong to the United States. But admitting, for argument sake, all that has been said by my hon. friend opposite, we would have had an emigration much larger than we have had, had it not been for the adoption of this policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The hon. member says, hear, hear. My hon. friend opposite said I had made a vituperative speech. I do not know that the speech I made on the 9th March, or the speech I have made to-night, contain any vituperative remarks. Perhaps I would have wounded the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite if I had referred to what I consider the vituperative course of certain parties in the Dominion in decrying the country, in running it down and injuring its credit; but I do say this, that, under existing circumstances, without giving the National Policy credit for it, it would have been much more gratifying if the hon. gentlemen had taken the course taken by some of their papers three or four months ago, and have admitted that the country is more prosperous than it was, but that the National Policy was not the cause of it. Every unprejudiced man must admit that the country is in a more prosperous and hopeful condition, and I think it would have been more patriotic and more in the interest of the country to have admitted that fact. Many hon. gentlemen in this House communicated with me last Ses-

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.