

the tariff changes and who was forgetting for a moment that we were throwing off three or four millions of taxes. He spoke a moment afterwards of the drop in the revenues for the current year. He was not frank enough to say that that was caused by the fact that since the 1st of April there had been an almost entire cessation of imports in sugar. He complained again of some interview there had been between the Postmaster General and the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the result that he discovered that the Government were giving larger mail subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman had not had the patience, nor had he the candour, to go on and to say that in the interval between the old figures and the new, a large system of railways known as the New Brunswick Railway with a large and expensive postal service, had been taken over by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the payments that were formerly made to the New Brunswick Railway now appeared as made to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. member had one of his old-time remarks concerning the decline of trade, and after the unnumbered rebukes which he has received in this Parliament, I was somewhat surprised to find that with a view to discredit the Government, with a view to discredit the National Policy, he ventured to dwell once more upon the decline in trade between 1873 and 1890. He chooses as the first term of the comparison the volume of our foreign trade in 1873, when he knew perfectly well that the entire decline occurred during the five years when his tariff, his fiscal policy, and not ours influenced our foreign trade. He was not aware that the figures he gave would only have the effect of rebounding against himself, and of bringing our discussion back to his own wretched and lamentable fiscal record. It reminds one of the story that Joe Howe used to tell of a farmer of Digby, in western Nova Scotia, who went to spear a salmon with the handle of a bush scythe, and in doing so cut off his own head. That the hon. gentleman should have had the courage to remind this House of a decline in our foreign trade of from 41 or 42 millions, occurring during the four or five years when he was Finance Minister, is almost passing belief. I say that when Sir Richard Cartwright had control of the fiscal policy of this country, the trade went down by leaps and bounds, and when the Conservative party came into power the tide turned, and trade has steadily gone up by some 40 millions. However, unfair and uncandid as he was, I shall not make any statements so lacking in truth as to insinuate that he was the cause and ought to be held responsible for the 42 millions of a decline. I know better. That was in part due to great economic causes entirely beyond the control of any Finance Minister. I am not going to the extreme length of saying that the National Policy is calculated to develop foreign trade. That is not its aim and purpose, though during the existence of our National Policy our foreign trade has made a reasonable growth. The National Policy has cut down our foreign trade in two distinct respects. It has cut off the export of some of our own raw materials of manufacture, and cut off the import of foreign goods made from those very materials. In the article of household furniture, school furniture, church furniture and all that, the effect of the National Policy was to cut off the export of that birch and ash timber, to

Mr. WELDON.

cut off the drain of our sons who were going away to the American States to work up that wood and send it back to our provinces, and to cut off the supply of food products that was leaving our provinces as food for our own boys who were there in those foreign mills and factories making up that furniture. When you look at those trade tables you will find a decline in the exports of this timber, it is no longer going out, these food products are no longer going out, and the finished products are no longer coming in. There is a decline in the out-go and a decline in the imports, and that is one of the first effects of the National Policy; although that effect upon the volume of foreign trade was looked for, the policy which produces that effect, in my opinion, is no blunder, but a capital success. A second advantage of the National Policy was in respect of the manufactures that we are well calculated to make from the raw materials which we are not calculated to grow. We were led to import raw materials and to have them manufactured here and sold in our own market, so that under the National Policy we were importing raw cotton, raw manila and raw sugar for example—whereas earlier we had been importing cotton fabrics, cordage and refined sugar; and in respect to the bulk of that trade, again the foreign trade tables will show a decline in value. That was the expectation, that was the very aim of those who defended the National Policy—it was to keep for us our home market by giving employment to home labour, by building up our own towns and cities and thereby to put our people in the position of such greater thrift and comfort that they would be able to buy more largely than they had heretofore been buying of articles of luxury. I look at the tables, and I find that despite the fact that there has been a decline in articles of the first class I speak of, manufactured out of our own raw material, and articles of the second class manufactured out of raw materials grown abroad, so notable has been the increase in the comfort of the whole body of our people, that despite these two reductions, our foreign trade has grown by \$40,000,000. The hon. gentleman says that the bulk of the people are poor. He gives us his own bald and naked assertion, but he gives no proof. Year after year I have occasion to go into as many homes as the hon. gentleman, and I suppose a great many more. I know the condition of the people of my own county, and as the result of visiting hundreds of their homes, I take the liberty of stating that the bulk of the people are not poor. I give this as an illustration: Whereas twelve or fifteen years ago musical instruments were seldom to be found in the homes of the middle and working classes, pianos being hardly ever seen and organs being rare, now in the part of New Brunswick I represent the bulk of the farmers are supplying their homes with musical instruments. I put that fact against the hon. gentleman's assertions. We were treated once more by the hon. gentleman, as we have been treated times without number, and this unhappy nation has been treated times without number, to tales of extravagance. The hon. gentleman told us that when the Dominion began its career it spent \$13,500,000, and now we are spending \$36,000,000, and he cannot understand it. I will tell the House why he cannot understand it. The skies are too near his head and his horizon is too narrow. The hon. gentleman is a