

was cursed with such a bad Government. Why, inhabitants of the North-West had told him (Mr. Farrow) that this was the best Government for Manitoba and the North-West that had ever existed, and had said "God speed their policy." Why was it this hon. gentleman made such unpatriotic speeches? Was it to get back into power? Well, he thought they would lay this country waste, and desolate and burn it up, if they could only thereby reach the Treasury benches. That seemed to be their whole desire, but he trusted that it would be many years before they realized it.

Mr. MILLS said one hon. gentleman had told them how very unpatriotic they were on this side of the House in alluding to the large expatriation of people from this country to the United States. It was singular that hon. gentlemen opposite did not discover the unpatriotic character of such a proceeding while sitting on this side of the House. There was on the Journals of 1878 a resolution proposed by the hon. gentleman now leading the Government, expressing his great regret that a policy had not been adopted which would induce the people of Canada to remain at home; and the hon. Minister of Railways, when asked in what way the people of this country could be prevented from emigrating to the United States, replied that a Government was unworthy to occupy seats on the Treasury benches that could not adopt a policy which would secure that end. These hon. gentlemen, by lamentations of this kind, succeeded at the elections and came to office. They had had control of public affairs for the past two years, and so far from the emigration diminishing it had gone on at an accelerated pace. True, the emigration from this country to the United States, during the five years of Mr. Mackenzie's Government, had averaged 24,000 or 25,000 annually, but during the five years hon. gentlemen opposite had been in office previously, it had averaged 42,000 annually; during the first year of their return, it had increased by 10,000, and during the last year, it had exceeded the emigration of the last year of Mr. Mackenzie's Government by 76,000. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, feeling the force of these statistics, undertook to deny them, saying that they were wholly unreliable. Well, the returns were made up now exactly as they had been before, and if they were exaggerated last year they were exaggerated in 1875 and 1876, when the hon. gentleman relied on them. The fact was hon. gentlemen opposite had not kept their promises to the public. They had excited high expectations, and the people had been disappointed. The increased prosperity of foreign countries had enabled Canadian merchants to deal more largely with them than before. What did the hon. Minister of Finance do? He came down to the House two years ago and proposed a change in the tariff, and he further proposed that the people should be prevented from importing as largely as before. He said we were impoverishing ourselves by buying too much from abroad, and he undertook to cure that by discouraging trade with foreign countries. In spite of the tariff the increased building operations in American cities had caused an enlarged demand for Canadian lumber. Our lumbermen had been enabled to employ a larger number of hands both in the woods and at the mills, owing also to the increased demand for lumber in the West Indies and South America; and it was to our improved foreign trade that our increased prosperity, so far as it had increased, was due. If the emigration had diminished during the past month or two, it was because of that foreign trade. The Minister of Finance had stated that the revenue had increased; that trade with foreign countries had increased, and that that increased trade, which he had undertaken to prevent by the increased tariff, was evidence of our prosperity. That prosperity was, however, in direct opposition to the policy which the hon. Minister had enunciated in Parliament and incorporated in the fiscal legisla-

Mr. FARROW.

tion of 1879. The Minister of Agriculture had submitted statistics of the most preposterous character ever submitted to Parliament. The hon. gentleman undertook to state what the emigration was by a process in simple subtraction: so many people travelled by railway eastward and so many westward, and the difference between the two showed the number of people who had emigrated from Canada to the United States. It was perfectly obvious that no conclusion could be drawn, such as had been drawn by the Minister, from the statistics which he had submitted to the House. The hon. gentleman had affirmed that both sides of the House took an extreme view, especially hon. gentlemen of the Opposition. That bore a striking resemblance to the story of the colored man who remarked how much two ladies resembled each other, especially the one on this side. It was evident that this was a very disagreeable discussion for hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. They had formerly made loud complaints respecting the exodus, and during the elections of 1878 they raised a cry with respect to the extensive emigration, regarding which their patriotic feelings were very much excited. At that time the emigration reached 24,000 yearly; in fact, during the last year of the Mackenzie Government the number was 22,000—now it was nearly 140,000; but those hon. gentlemen did not complain; they decided it as unpatriotic to say anything about it. If hon. gentlemen opposite were honest in their declarations in 1878, they should call on their leaders to redeem the promises which they made to revive the trade and prosperity of the country. They had declared that this was in the power of a Government to do; although they of the Liberal party were under the impression that the prosperity of a people depended on the favor of Providence and their own industry. Hon. gentlemen opposite held that this was a mistaken view, and contended that a Government which adopted a proper fiscal policy could make the country prosperous in spite of the people or of Providence. The result had not been such as those who followed the present occupants of the Treasury benches had a right to expect. It had been anything but creditable to these hon. gentlemen, who, feeling they could make no defence, that they had disappointed the people, that they had excited expectations that could not be fulfilled, now complained that the subject should be in any way discussed.

Mr. McCALLUM said it appeared to him that gentlemen on the other side of the House could never learn by experience. They told the House, and wished the people of the country to believe, that during their reign on the Government side of the House, Canada was as prosperous as it is to-day. When they (the Conservatives) were on the other side of the House they had asked the Liberals to re-arrange the tariff, so as to assist the industries of the country, and thereby prevent, as far as possible, people going to the United States to seek employment. He had no doubt a great many people went to the United States. A great many young men went there to work at lumbering during the winter, but they returned in the spring. His hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) said he saw people crossing in armies at Port Huron into Michigan. He (Mr. McCallum) thought he had been as much as the hon. gentleman in that locality, as he did business there; but he had not witnessed the extraordinary exodus that was alleged to have taken place. He had seen, as he had stated, young men going there occasionally to work in the lumber woods, and he was satisfied that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) himself must have seen many young men leaving this country to go and work during the winter in the lumbering districts of the United States, and returning in the spring. This was the ground taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite, in support of their assertion that the country was not prosperous, and that they were flies on the wheel. They told the House that no legislation could assist the industries of the country; that prosperity was only owing to good crops; that they