

Mr. Landerkin. It is Mr. Dewdney who has the credit; he is the Government of the North West.

Mr. Davin. The hon. gentleman is mistaken about that. I like my hon. friend so much that I am always sorry when I cannot agree with him, and the consequence is that whenever he makes a remark I am doomed to regret. (Laughter.) Now, Sir, I will not waste time in dealing with the decrease in the savings banks deposits. That has been dealt with fully in the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, so that the answer to the hon. member for Queen's on that subject is in *Hansard*. With regard to shipping, I want to point out that the hon. gentleman must have been consciously disingenuous in what he said in regard to the decrease of the tonnage of vessels built in Canada. He tried to make out that that, too, was an evidence of diminished prosperity; yet the hon. gentleman must have known that within recent years the fashion has gone from timber ships to iron ships built on the Clyde; he must have known that large ships are registered in England—why? In order that they may escape municipal taxation. (Hear, hear.) And yet the hon. gentleman, knowing that, spoke as if he were speaking not in a Parliament like this, but before a jury, in which case when the trial is over and he has or has not got his verdict, there is no mere about it. If in Parliament when he can be answered he talks that way, what would he say on the hustings? Again he spoke about the census. Well, I am not going to take up the time of the House about that, but I see the eyes of my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) fixed on me, and a smile that is childlike and bland lighting up his countenance. I will ask his attention therefore for a moment to a few remarks I will make about the census and the exodus, and as he is great on comparisons of figures I will call his attention to this comparison. May I point out to the hon. gentleman that he is actually not reasoning when he takes a set of figures for one year, say 1877, and compares it with a set for 1887. The true comparison would be

the figures which we could show, had hon. gentlemen opposite continued in office since 1878, as compared with those we can show to-day. That would be the real comparison, showing the state of the country, had the Mackenzie Administration continued in office until to-day as compared with what it actually is under the Conservative regime. Had hon. gentlemen opposite remained in power what would have happened? We should have had a Pacific Railway extending probably 200 miles west of Winnipeg. East of Winnipeg we should have had the water stretches; we should have no North-West whatever, and the credit of Canada would not be what it is to-day. Now, take the census. Does anybody suppose we have anything to do with limiting or increasing the population? Does anyone suppose that the exodus would not take place whatever government was in power?

Mr. Mills (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. Davin. The hon. gentleman must suppose a great deal, because he knows very well that the natural cause of that exodus is the restless enterprising spirit of a progressive community such as ours. To say that the cause is to be attributed in any way to the quality of the Government shows a very bad state of perceptive powers, unless we had a state of things such as existed prior to 1878, when everybody was shrouded in gloom and no attempt made to develop our manufactures. But I say this, that with the country in a normal condition we have to account for the exodus by the enterprising spirit of restless educated young men who go across the line. Neither will I deal with what the hon. gentleman said about sugar, because after all that has been sufficiently dealt with. I want to refer once again to the negotiations at Washington and to what the hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.) said concerning them. He described the Ministers, especially the Minister of Finance, as going down to Washington dishonestly, with the view of putting obstacles in the way of reciprocity, and he went on to say that the Minister was greatly to be blamed because he showed difficulties on the Canadian side in the way of a certain treaty