

extravagance, the same corruption, the same degradation of political sentiment throughout the country, that characterised their former appearances upon the stage. We have all that repeated over and over, and we have in addition the fact that the price they were to pay us for returning them to power has turned out to be valueless—that the policy which was to make us all rich has made some of us a great deal poorer and cannot justly be credited with making any considerable class in the country richer. This cannot continue. The country is beginning to see that it has been sold in both directions. The indignation is growing through many sections of the country. It will not be denied that there is disaffection in Quebec, that there is disaffection in Ontario, that there is disaffection in New Brunswick and in all the other Provinces among the right hon. gentleman's own supporters. The difficulties he has created by his evil courses are coming upon him. The chickens are coming home to roost—whole flocks of them—some as members of deputations, some in the form of his own supporters in the House asking for impossibilities to be done to carry out the promises made to them and not fulfilled. The end cannot be long deferred, the end of broken promises and falsified hopes, the end of the reckless course of policy into which he has been betrayed. It may be postponed till the next election, but, unless that is brought on very soon, it is very probable that the disappointment of the hon. gentleman's own supporters with the lines of policy he has introduced will lead to a breaking up sooner, as happened once before when he had a large majority in the House and it melted away like snow in the sun.

Mr. RYKERT. What a pity. Would you not be sorry?

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman (Sir John Macdonald) laughs. We have seen him laugh before, when charges were made against him, but we have seen also his majority melt away from him.

Mr. RYKERT. When?

Mr. CASEY. In the autumn of 1873.

Mr. BOWELL. What did it cost you?

Mr. CASEY. They claimed a majority of 36, but the Government was defeated before it went to the polls, and, when it did go to the polls, it was defeated so crushingly that it was clear to every one that the people had pronounced a verdict of general condemnation against that hon. gentleman and his associates. I say that verdict was temporarily suspended in consequence of promises made to us which have not since been fulfilled. That verdict must now be carried out, and the hon. gentlemen, who have been out on bail, so to speak, must be called up for sentence and must suffer that punishment which they have so richly deserved.

Mr. STAIRS. Though it is rather a late stage in the debate, I desire to make a few remarks upon the subjects which have been discussed during the last few days in this House. I shall not reply very directly to any of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, because I consider that he has been replied to most fully in the course of the debate by the different gentlemen who have spoken on this side of the House. I hope the House will bear with me if, in the course of my remarks, which will be more directly connected with the Maritime Provinces, and especially Nova Scotia, I dwell upon some of the general subjects that have already been treated. Several subjects have been touched upon during this debate in which we in Nova Scotia are very deeply interested indeed. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cartwright), I think, in reply to the Finance Minister, made some aspersions on the prosperity of Nova Scotia. I desire to reply to these; and I also desire, with the permission of

the House, briefly to touch upon the question of the sugar tariff, and the sugar trade, in reply to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). But in the first place I wish to refer to some statements of the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), in regard to the shipping interests of Nova Scotia and the Dominion. I think, Sir, that the hon. gentleman did not do himself justice in his remarks upon that subject. That I may not misrepresent what he said I would refer the House to his remarks upon that subject, as found on page 582 in *Hansard*. The general tenor of his remarks was in the direction of blaming the National Policy for the decrease in the shipping of the Dominion which has taken place during the last five years; and at the same time he claimed credit for the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) for the increase which took place in the shipping during the time he was in power. Now, Sir, I need not point out to the House how untrue such a claim is. Every hon. member knows that the Government in power at that time had nothing whatever to do with the prosperity, or want of prosperity, of the shipping industries of Canada engaged in the foreign trade. I have gathered some statistics which show that nearly every country in the world engaged in shipping has suffered a decrease during the last four or five years greater than the decrease in Canada or Nova Scotia, or even in Prince Edward Island, from which that hon. gentleman comes. I regret that I shall have to weary the House with a few figures, but still in a case of this kind it is impossible to reply to the hon. gentleman's statements without making use of figures. Now, I think his comparison was very unfair in one respect and that is when he compared the shipping of the Dominion of Canada with that of the United Kingdom. Everyone knows that the shipping of the United Kingdom at the present time is largely composed of iron steamships. It is well known, too, that the increase in the shipping of that country has been in iron steamships, and not in sailing vessels; and I shall be able to show that not only has there not been any increase in the sailing vessels of the United Kingdom during the period to which that hon. gentleman referred, but there has been in reality a decrease to a very much greater extent than has taken place in the Dominion of Canada. In the list which I shall read the tonnage refers only to sailing vessels, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to note especially the percentages of decrease or increase:

Country.	1878.	1882.	Decrease.	Per cent.
Hamburg.....	144,821	138,462	6,359	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Germany.....	949,467	915,446	34,021	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Finland.....	293,921	272,147	21,774	7 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Prussia.....	457,620	378,824	78,796	17 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Holland.....	299,522	217,517	82,005	27 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Belgium.....	10,319	6,750	3,569	34 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
France.....	730,075	566,786	163,289	22 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Italy.....	666,137	885,285	80,852	8 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
United States—				
Registered.....	1,458,209	1,137,724	320,485 inc.	21 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Licensed and				
Enrolled.....	1,586,878	1,672,382
United King-				
dom.....	4,238,692	364,650	617,042 dec.	14 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
		1881.		
Norway.....	1,475,017	1,454,777	20,238	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Sweden.....	454,491	450,368	4,123	$\frac{1}{2}$ %
Denmark.....	204,586	191,983	12,603	6 $\frac{1}{2}$ %

In the case of the United States, I admit there was a slight increase in the shipping engaged in the home trade that is called the licensed or enrolled, and which is engaged in the coasting trade. In the case of the United Kingdom there was a decrease of 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But in the comparison instituted by the hon. gentleman, he said there was an increase in the shipping of the United Kingdom. Of course I do not say that he said there was an increase in the sailing ships of the United Kingdom, but he said there was an increase in the shipping, and then he made a comparison of the sailing vessels of Canada, and the sailing vessels and