

said, because it seems to require no remark. There may be a point in it, but his sentences are so involved that it is difficult to discover any point. He wants to know if the fisherman has bounties why not the lumberman as well. Yet the lumber trade, according to his own showing, was never in a more flourishing condition than it is to-day, and the hon. gentleman will find it as difficult to get information from the lumbermen as from the farmers. The reason is, they have no such information to give as he is looking for. There is a lumberman behind me of high standing and character who is as well acquainted with the lumber trade as any man in the country. Let the hon. gentleman look at his books and he will find no cause of complaint. He will find that the lumbermen are suffering from no reverse. On the contrary, so flourishing has been the lumber trade in the past year that \$12,000,000 worth were actually exported over the previous year. As for the farmers, he has admitted that they are so prosperous, owing to the prices of everything they raise that it is quite unnecessary to refer to them. That hon. gentleman must have another personal fling at my hon. friend. He is very anxious there should be no nepotism in this country, that Ministers of the Crown should show an utter disregard of their own relatives, that when they make friends they should make them abroad. That when they wanted support of the great companies that was all right, but no Minister of the Crown should pay any attention to his own connections. I think, if the hon. gentleman would look into the Public Accounts, he will find a few pensioners of his own name and connections entered in them. It is, therefore, not very safe for him to fling a stone in that direction. He complains also of the mode in which the Civil Service has been dealt with in making improper promotions. I ask the hon. gentleman to take up the record of this Government and find one case analogous to the mode in which promotion was abused and the introduction of parties into the public service abused under his Government. Let him refer to the Post Office Department, and he will find the case of a stranger, not belonging to the country at all, who was brought in and appointed over the heads of civil servants, men of character, standing and intelligence, and able to teach that gentleman his duty. Yet this stranger was forced in over their heads at a salary which they could not acquire after twenty years service. Let the hon. gentleman then go to the Customs Department, and he will find that for a supporter of one of his hon. colleagues the same operation was performed; and gentlemen who had served long years in the public service were taught the melancholy lesson that no matter how well they performed their duties they were to remain in the back ground whenever a Minister had a friend or favorite to push over their heads. In the Public Works Department a still more flagrant and notorious instance of political favoritism occurred. A man brought in from the outside was pushed from pillar to post until he was landed, after three or four years service, in the position of Deputy Minister, when these hon. gentlemen went out of power. When the hon. gentleman finds three cases under this Administration to compare with those I have mentioned, he may fairly venture to throw his taunts across the floor of this House at the mode in which promotions are made under this Government. The hon. gentleman taunted my hon. friend with having framed a Tariff most disastrous to the shipbuilding industry. Where did the hon. gentleman get his authority? Does he not know that there has been a keen competition going on between iron and wooden ships, in which the latter have been worsted? Does he not know that all he could do himself to strike down the shipbuilding industry he did; and that although we did succeed in staying his arm to some extent, it was not until we came back to power, that, by our giving a drawback to the extent of the duty imposed on the materials used in shipbuilding, that industry had any fair play.

Let me read the hon. gentleman a statement from the *Wind sor Mail*, County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia. That statement reads:

"During the year just closed Hants County built twenty-six vessels measuring 19,044 tons. Never but once in the history of the county was there such a large amount of shipping built as during the past year. The total number of vessels on our list is 252, measuring 163,144 tons. More than half of these are barques and ships, nearly all of which are engaged in the foreign trade. The amount of capital invested in this country during the past year alone is not far short of \$600,000, and the total value of the shipping of the county amounts to considerably over \$4,000,000. There was built last year in this county nearly one ton of shipping for every inhabitant, and the total amount of shipping on the list would average seven tons for every man, woman and child in the county."

Yet the hon. gentleman says the shipbuilding industry is suffering. He wants to know why we are going to relieve the fishermen. He cannot get this bounty for the fishermen out of his mind. It seems to disturb the hon. gentleman. But I can tell him there will be no such difficulty with the poor and hardy fishermen. They will not whine over this bounty as the hon. gentleman is inclined to do. He says the Minister of Finance proposes to relieve the fishermen of his native Province and of the Maritime Provinces. But what is he going to do with all these numerous classes of people such as clergymen, schoolmasters, clerks and others, whose income is to a certain extent fixed? Let him go to any clergyman, and he will find the same difficulty as to the information he wants as he finds with the farmers. But, Sir, the clergyman will tell him that, under this fiscal policy, the congregation that was struggling, unable to do as they wished to do, to sustain the church to which they belonged, they have now ample means to give their clergyman the comforts he and his family requires. When he goes to the schoolmaster, the schoolmaster will tell him: "Why, Sir, you have mistaken me if you think I am an object of sympathy. The number of children who can be sent to school now—whose parents formerly were struggling with poverty, unable to clothe them—is such as to give me ample reward." The demand for teachers, like the demand for knowledge, like the demand for luxuries, has grown just as the revenue of the country has grown, grown just as the industries have grown, and just as everything that is in the interest of Canada has grown from the time the hon. gentleman was deprived of the power of longer throwing his blight over all the industries of this country from end to end. In the matter of clerks, before, while the hon. gentleman was in power every third man you met wanted to know if you could not give him some little office that would give him \$200 or \$300 a year. He would say, I am an accomplished accountant, a good writer, and have a thorough knowledge of grammar, which the hon. ex-Finance Minister honors so highly, but I can get no employment. If you want a man possessing these attainments to-day you have to search for him, because the demand for that kind of labor, created by the industries that have grown up, has made it almost impossible to get such men who previously searched in vain for employment. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman made a very remarkable admission the other day. He said: "I feel much more disposed to blush for the degradation of Canada"—that is the language with which the hon. gentleman invites people to come to this country—"and to tremble for the consequences hereafter." Sir, I do not wonder the hon. gentleman trembles. I should be greatly surprised to see him blush. He is much more in the brazen shield line than in the blushing line. What is the dread hereafter he trembles to meet? It is the next election, Sir. I am told already, that not only is there a revolt among the hon. gentleman's supporters in this House—and I am not surprised that they should be anxious for him to relinquish the position of financial spokesman of the party—but that his constituents are equally willing to let him make his bow and give them an opportunity of being better represented. I am not surprised