

it showed conclusively that under a revenue tariff the manufactures which we would all like to see grow and increase and fructify in this country, did grow and increase and fructify in the period from 1873 to 1878, in a manner pleasing to every patriotic man. I say further that that fiscal system, although it did not keep all the people in the country, succeeded in stopping a large portion of the exodus that was going on. Our population maintained itself wonderfully during that period, not only in the cities, but in the rural districts; while real estate advanced steadily in value, and in 1878 maintained a price as great if not greater than it did in 1873. More than that, our shipping went on increasing to such an extent that during that period we added to the registered shipping of this country \$5,000,000 worth of tonnage. All these things show not only that a revenue tariff is not only good in itself, but is suitable to the condition of affairs existing in this country; we know that, not only from theory, but from a practical application of the principle, not from 1873 to 1878 alone, but also from 1867 to 1878.

Now, Sir, from 1878 until the present, what have we to congratulate ourselves upon? We are told by the Finance Minister that we ought to congratulate ourselves upon our increased foreign trade. But is not his policy one the main object of which is to restrict our foreign trade? That main object of a protective tariff is to exclude foreign goods; yet still the hon. gentleman turns round very coolly and congratulates himself on the fact that the main object he had in view has not been achieved and that the commerce of the country has expanded in spite of his policy. He coolly takes credit to himself as the result of the National Policy of the very expansion in our foreign trade which the National Policy was destined to destroy. He tells us about the increase in our exports. I am not going to dwell upon that point, because it has already been very fully and ably treated by a number of gentlemen behind me during this debate, further than to remark that it is childish to attribute to the National Policy the increase on the quantities exported of the products of the farm, the forest and the sea. The National Policy neither causes the rain to fall, the sun to shine, the grain to grow, our hardy toilers to increase the quantity of their productions nor any of the causes to exist which enable us to augment the quantity and value of Canada's exports. Nor on the other hand, does it affect or contral the prices of these exports. The whole difference of opinion as to Canada's rate of progress between the two parties, it seems to me, consists in the aspirations and hopes which animate each of them. These gentlemen opposite are satisfied with the lamentable increase in our prosperity which we have had for the past few years. They are satisfied that a million of our people

should have fled from our country in the last decade. They are satisfied that the values of real estate should have fallen 25, 30 and 40 per cent. They are satisfied that ship-building as an industry has been wiped out of existence. They are satisfied that the registered tonnage of the country has fallen, as it has since 1878, \$11,000,000 in value. But, we on this side, hope for better and higher things for this young country. We look to the great North-west, and hope to people it; and we hope to do that, not by means of the "vigorous immigration policy" which has characterized hon. gentlemen opposite, but by means of a policy which will give the lands of that country into the hands of actual settlers, by a policy which will not put a paltry 100,000 people there in twenty years, but will establish half a million people there in that period, I venture to say, and I think I am using language of quiet soberness and truth that if it had not been for the unnatural restrictions imposed on the trade and commerce of the country, if it had not been for the unnatural land laws enforced against the settlers, we would have had to-day half a million more people in that country than we have. We, on this side, hope for greater things, and will not be satisfied with the slow rate of progress at which Canada has been going. I listened with pain the other night to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), whose position entitles him to speak with some authority on mercantile matters, when he stated that the progress made on that part of the Dominion from which he and I come, was one with which he is satisfied. Satisfied—when his own metropolitan city of Halifax has lost in population over 7,000 people in the last ten years. Satisfied—when the great province of Nova Scotia has in ten years added but 10,000 people to its whole population. Satisfied—when New Brunswick stands to-day where she stood ten years ago, without 1 per cent added to the number of her population. Satisfied—when Prince Edward Island has added in ten years the enormous number of 97 people to her population. Satisfied—when the real property of all these provinces has gone down in value from 20 to 40 per cent. Satisfied—when our shipping which ploughed the seas a few years ago has disappeared, and \$11,000,000 of its tonnage cannot be found. Satisfied—because a few mushroom manufacturing factories have been built up, many of which are closed one-third to one-fourth of the year, and which give employment to a few thousand people at the cost of the great farming, fishing and mining interests of the country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there may be some things in which we may take just pride. There has been an increase in our savings banks deposits and in our exports and imports. These things indicate that we are going ahead to some extent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)