

of the shipping interests of the Maritime provinces to the National Policy, and then he proceeded to argue that that depression was caused by other considerations entirely. Now, I will read from the remarks of my hon. friend from Queen's on this point:

The hon. gentleman stated that we ought to be proud, and that we ought to congratulate ourselves upon the marvellous increase in the shipping of this Dominion, that there had been such an enormous increase in the tonnage of the shipping to carry off the produce of this Dominion. So far, so good. There has, no doubt, been an increase; but is it an increase upon which we ought to congratulate ourselves? Let us examine the figures and see. In 1873 the registered shipping of this Dominion was 1,073,718 tons; in 1878 it had reached high-water mark, and was 1,333,015 tons, being an increase of 259,297 tons in those five years.

Then he proceeded to show the falling off in the tonnage of the shipping of the Dominion, and of the loss that accrued thereby to the people of the Dominion, more particularly to the people of the Maritime provinces, who were the principal owners of the tonnage, and he said, not that the tonnage had fallen off in consequence of the National Policy, but hon. gentlemen opposite had said that the National Policy had increased enormously the value of the shipping interest and increased the welfare of the people of the Maritime provinces in that direction, which was not correct. But the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) made the most amusing statement in contradiction of the position assumed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and as it may mislead some of his bucolic friends in Ontario during future elections, I will correct it here, so that both he and those who read his speech may obtain the benefit of further information. The hon. gentleman said that the falling off in shipping was caused by circumstances over which the Government had no control. I am amused to notice that whenever there is a decrease in prices, or in commodities, or in any direction whatever, hon. gentlemen opposite denounce the idea that the Government could possibly have any control over such matter. If the export trade had fallen off, it would have been argued that it could not be laid to protection. When the export trade increased and the quantity of our grain shipped was large, and good prices were obtained, hon. gentlemen opposite congratulated themselves that they had done it all. So when shipping increased, they claimed it was a result of the National Policy; but if it fell off, or, in fact, if any other trade declined, then hon. gentlemen opposite shifted the burdens from themselves, and laid it on economic causes entirely beyond their control. In order to give an illustration of the alarming decline in shipping on account of the depression in which shipping interests of the Maritime provinces have been subjected to, the hon. member for Centre Toronto sent out to the reading-room for the Montreal "Witness," in order to call the attention of the House to some statistics

MR. FLINT.

that had caught his eagle eye. He invited the House to look at the great falling off in shipping. He said there are 80,000 steamships tied to the docks in different parts of the world. Then the hon. gentleman went on to enlarge in his own way on the subject, and offered amusing observations in regard to shipping. So soon as those figures caught my ear, I was satisfied that the hon. gentleman was labouring under a mistake, and that he had been led into error owing to his ignorance of the subject. When we know that instead of 80,000 steam vessels laid up, there are only 20,000 steamships in the world, we can see the absurdity of the hon. gentleman's position. I did not see the original article, but I presumed it mentioned 80,000 tons, which would represent about 40 vessels, which did not show so very great depression in the shipping interest. I conclude my remarks at the point at which the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Cameron) commenced, and that is the census and the exodus. That is a subject which hon. gentlemen opposite generally evade. It is a subject which hon. gentlemen opposite display a wonderful amount of ingenuity in explaining away. The hon. member for Richmond comforted himself for our small increase in population by the fact that China, Russia, Siberia and Tartary had had large increases in population, but they were very poor and distressed countries, suffering from a great many troubles which Canada, we trust, will never suffer from. It is true that China has increased enormously in population, and also that there is a great deal of poverty in that country. It is true that Siberia and Russia occupy the same position. But my hon. friend will recollect that all these countries are protectionist countries; that if China is suffering from poverty and all that goes with poverty, and if Russia is suffering from famine and poverty, it is not for want of a higher protectionist tariff policy. They are suffering to a large degree, I think, from the very fact that they had deliberately shut themselves out from communication with the world, and from those softening influences with which the freest possible trade would surround them, and introducing with it all the elements of civilization, and those other elements of education and culture which go to make a country happy and prosperous. But when we come to this Dominion, hon. gentlemen explain the decrease as shown in the census by intimating that the Government, as usual, had no control over the movement of population. The Government promised that they would stop the exodus. They pointed out that the exodus was one of the alarming features of the condition of affairs between 1874 and 1878, when the depression was general throughout the world, and Canada felt the effect of that depression to a very large extent. The exodus was to be stopped, and great benefit was to accrue to

RR