

Which is conclusive evidence of the extraordinary productive prosperity of Nova Scotia, despite depreciated values of our exports in foreign markets, the West Indian market for fish having dropped far below paying prices. If the tariff had not been reduced and values had remained as in 1893, we would have had a surplus last year of over \$3,000,000, instead of a deficit of over \$1,000,000, and it could be also clearly shown that customs duties per capita were no greater last year than they were during the time the Grit government was in power, in 1878.

Talking of the public debt of Canada, which is not materially increasing, four items alone of government expenditure amount to more than the debt by about \$12,000,000—

Provincial debts assumed . . .	\$110,000,000
Canadian Pacific Railway . . .	63,000,000
Intercolonial and branches . . .	45,000,000
Canals	39,000,000
	<hr/>
	\$257,000,000
Deduct net debt about	245,000,000
	<hr/>
	\$12,000,000

Besides providing annually for the interest and daily expenditures of the government service. Then, as regards the public debt, it has not increased to any appreciable extent; and what is our public debt composed of? The figures I have given show it. It is composed of four particular items and the expenditures on three services were really the whole amount of our national debt, and I will again read them to you. The provincial debt was first \$110,000,000 as near as I can come at it. The government is not responsible for that debt. Then we have the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$63,000,000; we have the Intercolonial and branches, \$45,000,000 and Canals, \$39,000,000, making \$287,000,000 expended on those works. Were they not for the benefit of Canada, and is not Canada deriving the benefit of them? Is there any man in this House or in the country who would say that any one of those enterprises is not in the public interest and that we do not receive advantages from them more than their cost? Then, we deduct the public debt. The debt was about \$245,000,000 and then we have a sum of \$12,000,000 that those works cost more than the national debt of the country to-day. Therefore, I may say to my hon. friend, when he based that assertion

that the depression and the failure of the National Policy, was owing to the debt of the country and the deficit and the falling off of exports, that he was not justified in making such a statement. I will now turn to my hon. friend from Marquette, and I regret that I do not see him in his place. I was very much surprised at the assertions he made, and the position he took here in the House. To me it was deplorable to find the hon. gentleman labouring under the delusion that we, by decreasing the tariff, would increase the revenue and increase the manufacturing industries of the country. It was novel to me; it was a position I thought that no person had ever taken in this House and a position which I could not see how he could attempt to justify. My hon. friend seems to think that we can do without any revenue at all—at least, that is the deduction that I draw from his remarks—that we could carry on the government in all its different branches without a revenue. The hon. gentleman must know that we have to make up \$35,000,000 a year in order to carry on the ordinary expenses of the government. If the free trade principle which the opposition profess were to prevail, how could that revenue be raised? The opposition went to the people in 1891 on a policy of going into a commercial partnership with the United States and we know the result. The people rejected that policy and the hon. gentlemen are still in opposition. No wonder they are growing desperate and are taking up a policy which even in England itself is condemned by the masses of the people. When free trade was established, Cobden himself declared that, within ten years, every civilized country in the world would adopt free trade. The result has been the reverse—every country excepting England has a protective tariff and is competing with the English manufacturers in their own market, and competing with them successfully in every market throughout the world. There is a feeling in England that things cannot remain as they are—that there must be some change in the interest of labour and the industries of the country which will prevent them being swamped by foreign competition. When a change comes it must be in the direction of protecting the industries of their own country. My hon. friend from Shell River claimed that the manufacturers of this country were making enormous fortunes.