

improvement which, I think, will satisfy every reasonable man that the influence of the National Policy has not all events been injurious. I labor under the very great disadvantage that so much has been said on this question that it is difficult to make a new point, and therefore I hope the House will overlook the very imperfect manner in which I have put my views before it. I rose more especially for the purpose of controverting the statements made by the hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and I hope I have succeeded in showing that the Maritime Provinces are not in that gloomy serious condition in which they would have us believe them to be. I believe on the contrary that during the past five years, the period in which the National Policy has been in operation, the various industries of the Maritime Provinces have gone on prospering, the people have accumulated a very large amount of wealth and have reason to be hopeful for the future. I have reason to believe that not only in the staples of lumber and fish their position will improve, but that they will be able, by their energy and through their proximity to the sea to, compete with the older Provinces in manufactured goods.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has devoted a good deal of time to showing that the Province of New Brunswick is much more prosperous now than it ever was before, and that the prosperity of that Province is the result of the National Policy. What industries does he cite to prove this assertion? What statistics does he give to prove that the National Policy has been a success? Has he given the statistics of manufacturing industries? Not to any extent; he attributes the increased prosperity of New Brunswick chiefly to the increased prosperity of the farming, fishing and lumbering industries. He is the first gentleman I have ever heard in this House assert that those industries were in any way favored by the National Policy, or that their prosperity could be taken in any way as a proof of the success of that Policy. What has the National Policy done for the exports of farm products to the foreign markets? Has it improved the foreign market? Has it obtained the entry of these goods into the United States at a lower duty than formerly? Has it increased the demand for them in the United States? Has it increased the demand for fish in the United States? We all know that the success of the fishing industry depends entirely upon the American market. What has been done in that respect for the fishing industry by the National Policy? We know that at present our fish is admitted free into the United States; we know that this free admission will cease next spring, but we do not know that the Government have taken any step towards securing a continuance of the treaty, or towards substituting a new treaty which will continue to the fishermen of New Brunswick the privilege of free admission of fish into the United States. It may be taken for granted that the Government have taken no such steps, because if they had they would have been certain to tell us and take credit for it, and the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces must condemn the policy of inaction of the Dominion Government, and demand that some steps be taken to assure the continuance of the privileges which they now enjoy. This leads me to what the hon. gentleman has said about reciprocity. He says the Government have done all they could to obtain reciprocity. I thought he was going to make some ministerial revelations, because we had never heard of any steps being taken by the Government to that effect, but he went on to explain that all the Government had done was to put a provision in our tariff laws authorising the Government to abolish Canadian duties when corresponding duties were abolished by the United States. That is what he claims is doing all the Government could do to obtain reciprocity. Now does the hon. gentleman suppose that reciprocity is obtained simply by making an official arrangement

like that in our tariff laws? The hon. gentleman must know better than that; he must know that it is necessary to send an ambassador to a foreign country with authority to agree upon the terms on which a reciprocity treaty can be entered into. That was the course adopted when the late reciprocity treaty was secured, it was the course adopted by the Government of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) when they sought to obtain reciprocity with the United States, and it was a course which succeeded, so far as the negotiations with the Government of the United States was concerned, the treaty having been afterwards blocked by the United States Senate. It is not the people of the Maritime Provinces alone, although they are specially interested in this matter, who will call on the Government to carry out the pledges they have made with regard to obtaining reciprocity. The great end and aim of the National Policy, it was said, was reciprocity. In the historic National Policy resolution, it was formally declared that the effect of the National Policy would be ultimately to bring about reciprocity with the United States. That was regarded as the climax of all the perfections of the proposed policy, and that was the main argument used to induce the people of Canada to adopt a policy which, in other respects, was admittedly hostile to many of their interests. What has been done? What negotiations have been opened with the United States? What commissioner has been sent there to treat with them? What attempt has been made even to meet them half way? We find even in the President's message this year that it is the policy of the United States to obtain reciprocal treaties with the other nations on this continent. We do not find that the Government has been meeting them half way. If it has been taking any steps in that direction, if it has been carrying out its pledges, it is time that it should make the country aware of it, because the expiration of the Washington treaty during the coming spring will intensify the desire which exists in many parts of Canada to obtain a treaty of this kind. But no doubt the statements of the hon. member for Gloucester will be dealt with in greater detail by those who are more familiar with the local interests concerned, and I shall pass at once to consider briefly the points brought before us by former speakers. I cannot do better than commence with the remarks of the hon. Finance Minister himself, the great authority on all questions of finance, the great oracle on all questions of policy. That hon. gentleman this year, as usual, opened his Budget with a great flourish of trumpets. He was going to prove to this House, to make the House and the country believe, that things were in a very prosperous condition generally. He opened his speech with a remark of that kind, but as he went on, we were led to think that the flourish of trumpets was intended to conceal the emptiness of the Budget itself which he was to disclose to the House. He posed, as he has always posed hitherto, as the prophet—I might say more than the prophet—the high priest of the National Policy. He stood before us with all the fervor of a new convert in that attitude. We know he is a convert, we now that not many years ago he was an opponent of protection, and we know that a new convert is always more fervent than an old and steadfast believer. He has shown us that fervor this year in the capacity of a new convert.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I hope hon. gentlemen who make those sounds on the other side do not wish to ridicule the position of the Finance Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I know it is an awkward position for the hon. gentleman to be placed in, and I hope they will spare his feelings and not make any more of those noises. In