

was placed upon the Statute-book. Now, we find that instead of prosperity, instead of abounding happiness, instead of general contentment, there is unrest and discontent, and protests from almost every portion of the country, with the manner in which this policy has crushed the people and prevented their natural and legitimate development. We all remember the promises which heralded the introduction of this policy, and the manner in which they have been fulfilled. We had promises that it would reduce importation, and it did appear, looking at the matter superficially, as if the imports might be reduced, and as if the balance of trade would be turned, as they call it, in favour of this country. Yet when we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns for the last five years we find that the balance of trade is heavier, to a very large degree, against the Dominion, than it was during the five years of which they bitterly complained when they were in Opposition. The average balance of trade against us was \$20,000,000 for the five years subsequent to Confederation; but the average balance of trade against the Dominion during the last five years in the hey-day of the National Policy, has been still larger by one or two million dollars. They promised that taxation would not be increased; that promise has been signally falsified. Taxation has been enormously increased. They promised us, if we would permit them to increase still further the tariff upon iron manufactures, that a great impetus would be given to the iron industry. Well, we have added one or two million dollars per annum to the taxation of the people of the country, coming directly from the taxation of iron and iron goods, and the bonus given to this industry. Yet, the industry itself has actually declined. None of those glowing promises, which were held out, either as to the opening up of new markets, as to the introduction of a larger population, or as to a general improvement in the condition of the people, have been fulfilled, while in addition to the enormous taxation that has been paid into the Treasury directly every industry has been handicapped and burdened by the extra price of iron and iron materials which were necessary in carrying on those trades to advantage. The Minister of Finance made one or two statements, which although a little apart from the line I have been discussing, I think are of sufficient importance to refer to merely as an incident in this discussion and as a caution to his supporters not to rely too implicitly on his statement, at least in one particular. The hon. gentleman stated in regard to the total increase of expenditure last year, that we paid for a session of 219 days \$1,262,000, while for the preceding year, although there was a longer session, we paid for 155 days \$596,000, and in several instances in the later portions of his speech, he attributed, by inference, at least, to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, the responsibility for an increase in the expenditure for legislation.

Mr. FLINT.

In the first place, I presume the Minister of Finance has on his mind so many important matters that he has relied on some one else to give him the figures, and the person who gave him the figures was misled in some way which I cannot account for. Last year, instead of 219 days, there were only 137 days constituting the session; instead of the expenditure being greater than that of the previous session, it was actually less. Any person, by looking at the returns, can see how this occurred. The previous session lasted into the new financial year, and a large sum of the expenditure for the session of the previous year was charged, as a mere matter of book-keeping, to the succeeding year, which made it appear that the session of 1892 actually covered a longer period than 1891, although the time consumed was much shorter. If the account was carefully balanced for each session by itself, it would be found that last session cost less than the session before by \$414,000 and that the session was much shorter. I think any candid gentleman will agree with me, that, while it is the duty of the Opposition to insist that every question before the House shall be fully debated, and it is not open to the Government to charge them with unduly lengthening the session if they choose to debate important subjects, yet, when the session is lengthened by the act of the Government, it is highly improper to charge the Opposition with being the cause of lengthening the session. The most important matter brought before the House last session was the Criminal Law Bill, a very lengthy and extensive measure. The House did not go into committee on the Bill until the eighty-fourth day of the session, and it was almost the only important Government measure that was brought down. The Redistribution of Seats Bill was introduced sixty-six days after the opening of the session, and the second reading took place on the ninety-eighth day, and the debate on that Bill was very brief. So I think it was unfair, as well as incorrect, to charge the Opposition with being the cause of any increase whatever in the length of the session, even supposing my hon. friend had not made the mistake as to the length. The progress of the country has been alluded to, and there has been progress made. We are gratified with the progress recorded. Why should there not be progress in a country having such vast resources? The fact that the country has made substantial progress in some directions, notwithstanding the burdens of the tariff, is a tribute to the wealth of the country, to the character, intelligence, sobriety, honesty and industry of its people, and it augurs well for its future, if more correct economic conditions can be brought about, to enable the people to develop their resources naturally and properly, without giving undue influence and opportunity for making money to the classes against the masses. It is a complaint, even among hon. gentlemen supporting the Ad-