

John had exported 57,000 odd bushels of grain more than the combined export of the same articles from Boston, New York and Philadelphia. That, I think, was an important statement. It might mean much or it might mean little. I think we can all take it to mean that we are pretty busily at work down in St. John exporting the products of Canada. Indeed, so busy are we in that line that we have already utilized to the utmost the facilities we have at our command. We have an application now before the government of Canada with regard to some operations down there, and I certainly hope that the members of the government will look into this matter very carefully and come to the conclusion that, in the interests of true statesmanship they will assist, in so far as they are asked to assist, the city of St. John in providing further facilities for this great work to which I have alluded.

Among the other things referred to in His Excellency's speech is the prosperous condition of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to belong to a party that has never yet indulged in decrying the country for the sake of making political capital. On the contrary we are proud to acknowledge the prosperous condition of the country. But we know that we have had a period of great expansion during the last few years. And we know that these periods of expansion and depression follow each other. We cannot always account for them. We may partially account for them sometimes by the good or bad harvests and probably these have as much as anything to do with the matter. But we know that good times and bad times come in cycles, and that this condition is not confined to Canada but applies to every country in the world. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) appeared to insinuate that the good times prevailing are the result of the wise government of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the treasury benches. I am willing to give them all the credit to which they are entitled, but I think we could not safely give them credit for having produced our present prosperity. I am old enough to remember how, under the government of the late Alexander Mackenzie, it was found necessary to provide soup kitchens for the great numbers of unemployed who thronged the lobbies of this parliament and the streets of Ottawa. I was not willing at that time to ascribe the bad condition of affairs wholly to lack of statesmanship on the part of the Mackenzie government. Canada suffered from a period of depression which affected many other countries besides. And I think that this is a good rule, and, being so must work both ways. But, Sir, if the government of a country have any control over that country's prosperity, it must surely be through its fiscal policy. And, that being so, I would ask hon. gentlemen on either side if due credit should not be

Mr. DANIEL.

given to the great national policy introduced by the late Sir John A. Macdonald in 1879 which is the basis, as I understand it, of the fiscal policy of the present government.

We have heard a good deal too of our buoyant revenue and our overflowing treasury. We are all very glad to hear of these things. But we must remember that, while we have had surpluses for some years past, we have also been increasing the net debt of the country. We must also remember that, whereas in 1896 the expenditure was \$7.56 a head, in 1902 it was \$9.30 a head. And during the time between these years, if my figures are correct, we have increased our net debt by no less than \$14,000,000.

With regard to the Militia Bill that is promised I have much pleasure in stating that I have been a member of the militia long enough to wish it well and to do anything that is in my power to help to strengthen it and give it the standing in the community that it ought to have. I believe that that is the sentiment animating every member on this side of the House. Therefore, the government will find no difficulty in passing any such Militia Bill as they are able to show to be beneficial to the militia. In fact, after listening to the remarks made by the right hon. leader of the government with regard to his desire to have a fuller treaty-making power in this country, I think it of importance that we should have not only this Militia Bill, but many more militia bills and a much more efficient military service than we have at the present time.

I think myself that we ought to have not only this Militia Bill but many other militia bills in order to secure a more efficient and effective militia service than we have at present. More than that I think that it was a grave omission that under these circumstances there was no mention in the speech from the Throne of a navy Bill being introduced, because if we are going to be so independent of everybody, if we are going to make our own treaties, surely we will have to defend them. We cannot make our own treaties and then go to the motherland and say: Here, we made a treaty with some one over there who will not keep it; will you not go and make them keep it for us? Is that the position which a country so large as Canada intends to occupy? Surely the members of the House and the people of this country have more self-respect than to wish to be placed in such a position as that, and if we are going to become independent and have this treaty-making power, let us wait until we have a population of at least 15 or 20 millions, and until we can provide ourselves not only with an army, but with a navy as well, so that we can take our place among the nations, and be able to defend our position and not become a second Panama. I shall not longer occupy the time of the House and