the maritime provinces? In Nova Scotia, the increase in population from 1871 to 1881 was 13.6 per cent. From 1881 to 1891, during which time the National Policy was in force, the increase in Nova Scotia was only 2.4 per cent. In New Brunswick, the increase from 1871 to 1881 was 12:4 per cent, and from 1881 to 1891, under the National Policy, there was no increase whatever. In Prince Edward Island, in 1871 to 1881 the increase in population was 15.8 per cent, and from 1881 to 1891, it was only a decimal -17 per cent. Yet hon, gentlemen contend that, although the census returns are against them, still, the country is happy and prosperous. But I ask them to compare the result as shown by the census with the promises in this resolution, that this policy would stop the exodus, increase keep population, our people home, and bring back those who were expatriated before 1878. This is the result seventeen years' experience of the National Policy. But we were told in the maritime provinces that the National Policy would encourage our sea-going shipping. This was the great industry of that country. I will give you a few figures of the rise, progress, and decrease of this industry:

	N.S. Tonnage.		P.E.I. Tonnage.
***********	449,701	277,850 335,965	38,918
•••••		156,086	54,250 20,970

From the foregoing table, it appears that while the registered tonnage of the three provinces in 1873 was as follows:—

•	Tens.
Nova Scotia	449,701
New Brunswick	277.850
Prince Edward Island	38,918
Total	766,469

It had increased in the year 1878 to the following figures:—

Nova Scotia	335.965
Total	943 583

Or an increase of 177,114 tons which, at the average value per ton, estimated by the Marine Department, of \$30, make an increase in the value of the registered tonnage of \$5,313,420, between the years 1873 and 1878. The National Policy was introduced in 1879, and has continued in force ever since. The registered tonnage in 1893, was:

Nova Scotia New Brunswick Prince Edward Island	156,086
Total	573 319

Or a decrease or loss of 370,264 tons, and, embodied in their platform and emat the same estimate of \$30 per ton, of blazoned on their banner the policy of

\$11.108.220. That is the result to the seagoing shipping of the maritime provinces. But could you expect anything else? No, Mr. Speaker, this result was prophesied in this House before the National Policy was adopted at all by Sir Charles Tupper, when he said that the policy of protection in the United States had driven the flag of that country from the seas, and given to other nations the carrying trade of the world. His prophecy has been fulfilled so far as the maritime provinces are concerned, not because ne said it, but because it was inevitable. But, although the National Policy has not benefited any of these industries, I want to be frank and fair; and I must confess here to-night that the National Policy has done some good in this country; it has benefited some people. It has benefited the combinations of this country; it has enabled combines to come into existence in this country as it has done in every country where protection is the policy. It has given us a cotton combine, a cordage combine, an oil combine, a nail combine, a sugar combine, and scores of others. And some people made millions out of the combinations thus fostered and encouraged by the law of the land, and all these millions have been unjustly made, although legalized by the action of this Parliament; and these millions came out of the pockets of the toiling masses and consumers of this country. Our friends opposite now declare: We never change our policy. But we have heard from them this year something far different from we heard before. what I remember, when, four years ago, we had a general election in this country, the Liberal leaders were branded as unpatriotic politicians plotting evil against the country, as men disloyal to the old flag, and to the motherland. The monopoly of loyalty, as of everything else that was good, was claimed by hon. gentlemen opposite. But we hear very little now about the old flag. Four years ago they were loud in their praises of England, its policy and its consequent prosper-To-day they actually tell the people of this country that England is suffering and going to destruction because the policy of free trade is adhered to. They bemoan the fate of England because the policy of that country is not protection, but free trade. They have lately started upon a mission to redeem and regenerate and from poor England effects save the of the free trade policy that she has folfor the last fifty years? The great Conservative party in England has been led within the last fifty years by some of the most eminent statesmen of the century. Is it not singular that it never dawned upon these great leaders that protection would be the better policy for England, that they never dropped free trade and embodied in their platform and em-