

plements, binder twine, iron and other things. And, strange to say, we have a plaintive cry coming up, of all places in the world, from Cape Breton, voiced by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who says: Touch not a single brick or the whole edifice will fall. This is a most extraordinary state of affairs. Those who are now most strenuous in their support of the National Policy are those who are being punished most severely by it. Of all places in the Dominion, Cape Breton has suffered perhaps the most. From that island there has been a greater percentage of exodus than from any other part of the Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It cannot be denied, and to-day, commercial atrophy, which is prevalent all over the Maritime provinces, is more prevalent in Cape Breton than anywhere else.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When I have finished the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to refute what I have said, not only by saying "no," but by producing some evidence in support of his statements. In the midst of this trial of the National Policy we have the Finance Minister coming forward and putting the best face upon it. He tells us that Canada, after all, is in a state of prosperity. He does not tell us in so many words that Canada owes that prosperity to the National Policy, but he hints at that, or leaves it to be inferred, hoping that the people will draw that inference, and doing what he can to induce those who are attacking the policy to cease those attacks. His method is ingenious, but I do not know that it is one very much to be commended. The hon. gentleman takes a period of twenty years and chooses that year which has the largest amount of trade, 1892, and that which has the smallest amount of trade, 1878, and claims the difference between these two as the measure of the increased prosperity of Canada. Well, Sir, is that fair; is it a candid and honest statement to present to the public? I do not think it is. We have had our ups and downs in trade matters since 1878, but, as a matter of fact, as has been already stated in this debate, the trade of Canada to-day is very little in advance of what it was in 1873 and 1874, nearly twenty years ago. It is a most unfair thing, therefore, to take that year when the trade of Canada was at its lowest and compare it with the year 1892, and claim the difference as the measure of the country's prosperity. But, Sir, I ask the hon. gentleman to take a different line; to take a period and not one particular year. Take that unfortunate period, as hon. gentlemen opposite regard it, that period that is denounced by them as one of the most disastrous in Canadian history, the period from 1873 to 1878, and compare that with the last five years, and then

judge of our prosperity. I think that is a fair view of the case. You hear hon. gentlemen say: We are all right; we are going ahead fairly well. They are satisfied with the increase in our population, satisfied with the increases which the census returns show in our manufactures. I am obliged to say, that many of these hon. gentlemen are perfectly honest in what they state, and that the difference between us arises from the difference in the point of view from which we look at it. These gentlemen are satisfied with small things. Why, Sir, if Canada is progressing in population one-fourth or even one-fifth as rapidly as it was hoped she would, and as we had a right to expect, these gentlemen say that is all right. But we are not satisfied. With the great natural material resources that Canada possesses, we had a right to hope and expect that the country would have progressed, not only in population, but also in wealth and manufactures and in output of surplus products, very much more than the statistics show she has done. Why, it would be a singular thing if, with the enormous extent of increased territory, with the enormous increase in the quantity of our lands under tillage, with the increase (though not so much as it ought to be) in our population, within the last twenty years, we should not be exporting now more than we did twenty years ago. And still, Sir, the fact is, that we are to-day exporting very little more than we were in the years 1873 and 1874.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not as much from the same territory.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend says that from the same territory we do not export so much. No doubt he is right, for to-day we count in the exports of the great granary of the world, the North-west, which, twenty years ago, added nothing to our exports. Now, Sir, take the increase of prosperity such as the hon. gentlemen have shown to be. Is that prosperity in any way attributable to the National Policy? Was the National Policy designed to increase the export of our surplus products, or did the most enthusiastic prophet of its results or the most ardent supporter of it say that it would result in such an increase? The National Policy was to limit the exports of our surplus and to provide a home market for those products. Therefore, if there has been an increase in the exports of our products, I do not think any supporter of the National Policy can claim that it is owing to that policy. What has been that increase? Why, Sir, if you consult the Trade and Navigation Returns, and examine the details of exports, you will find that the increase is almost entirely in animals and their products. Surely the National Policy has nothing to do with that. If there had been a great increase in the output of manufactures, I could understand giving the National Policy the credit for it. But, as I understand it, there has