

their houses; they could have many advantages that they cannot have when you take away their little earnings by increased taxation. Mr. Speaker, the Government certainly have done their duty with regard to finding employment in this Parliament building, and in the different Departments. I give them credit for having carried out their promise to find work for men here. When you come in at the lobby you will find two men at every door, a Frenchman and an Englishman, one to open the door in French style, and another in English style. You have to pass about fourteen men before you can get into this House. I would like to know how many doors there are in this House, and if you will tell me how many doors there are, I will multiply that by two, and that will give the number of doorkeepers. The messengers are in proportion; and in all the Departments it is the same. Perhaps I am a little extravagant in this; I may be coloring it too highly, but I am satisfied that it is pretty near the truth. I believe the Departments have a great many more servants than the business of this Dominion requires, or the people of this country are willing to pay for. I believe there is a great deal of extravagance. The Government can fairly congratulate themselves with having found work for a great many men here, and they have found work for a great many people away from here, to pay these men for standing here doing nothing. Now, with regard to the exodus, Mr. Speaker, I think there has been a great deal more said with regard to the exodus than there is any necessity for; and I think there was a great deal more said when the Liberals were in power, about the exodus, than there was any propriety in saying. It is not a pleasant thing for any of us to see people going away from this country. But you cannot help it; no Government can help it, and no policy will help it very much. People will come and go as they like; whenever they think they can benefit their condition they will go. I think Canada is a very good country to live in. We make a great fuss about people going, and we try to ascertain how many have gone by this mode of calculation and by the other; by school statistics, and so on; but we do not arrive at anything very definite. I think, however, we have arrived at this conclusion, that while the late Government were charged with permitting this exodus, it appears from the same sources of information that four times as many people have gone since hon. gentlemen opposite were in power than went before. But I do not blame hon. gentlemen opposite for that circumstance. How can they help it? Some go whom we should like to have here; sometimes men go whom we are glad to get rid of; but unfortunately many young men leave us. In the New Brunswick Legislature a young lawyer once rose and started to deplore the exodus, mentioning that thirteen journeymen tailors had left St. John a week before. An old farmer got up and said: It is a great pity those thirteen journeymen tailors did not take thirteen lawyers on their backs. I do not want to be personal; but if this exodus is going on, and we could get thirteen strong fellows to take the thirteen Ministers on their backs, I think it would be a good thing. I know it might be asked, with great propriety, how is it, if my views are correct, or at all correct, that this Government has gone twice to the country on their policy and been sustained each time by so large a majority. It has been said by some persons that they did not go exactly squarely to the country in 1878. But I think the people were not uninformed; they knew what the policy would be; the Government might not be just as outspoken as they would be under some circumstances, but the people were told what might follow. If the people were not informed what the policy would be it was not the fault of the Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite went to the country and were returned by an overwhelming majority. They brought in the National Policy boldly; they submitted it to Parlia-

Mr. GILLMER.

ment and carried it through and made it the law. That policy was tried for three or four years, and in 1882 they went back to the people. The country returned them by nearly as great a majority as before. Those are arguments sufficient for hon. gentlemen opposite. I admit that they went fairly before the country, and the country knew what their policy would be if the Government was sustained. I know that a Government always has a very considerable following. David, at the Cave of Adullam, collected all in debt and all in distress, and all who were discontented, and made a goodly number. The Government influence. In their case we might add office holders and office seekers, and contractors, sub-contractors, and all the sharks that always follow a Government ship, in order to get some of the offal thrown overboard. But all that does not satisfy me as to why the Government obtained so large a majority. There must be something else which I cannot find out, some secret which the Government will not tell. I remember a story told about Lincoln. When he was a practising lawyer in Illinois, this case was placed in his hands. A man was indicted for stealing hams, and Lincoln had to defend him. At the outset Lincoln wished to know whether the man had stolen the hams or not, so that he might know how to conduct the case. The man said, I did steal the hams. Then, said Lincoln, you had better acknowledge your guilt and throw yourself on the mercy of the court. No, said the man, I have engaged you to defend me, and I will let the case go to the jury. The case went to the jury, and after a little while they returned with a verdict of not guilty, to the surprise of the court and council and every one else. After the court had closed Lincoln asked the man: How did you get a verdict in the face of such evidence? Why, replied the man, I wanted to go before the jury, because every one of the jury got a ham. I do not know whether every one of this jury got a ham, but they got something, or it would be impossible for the Government to return with such a majority. I want the Government to fulfil their promises. They have utterly failed to do so. In all ages there have been false prophets, men who have humbugged the people and promised to do things they could not do. There were the prophets of Baal, who kept continually humbugging the people, and making the people think they could do something they could not do. But at last came the test, and Elijah called on them to show their power. He told them to call on their Gods, and cry out to them; either the Gods were talking, pursuing, or peradventure asleep, and must be awakened. The prophets cried aloud, and cut themselves with knives and lancets till the blood gushed forth. Hon. gentlemen opposite have given us promises, and told us what they could do. They have had a trial and failed. Will they do as the prophets did, when they are asked to put the country in a prosperous condition? Elijah gave the prophets every chance, and taunted them a little, which was very naughty. Hon. gentlemen opposite never prayed more earnestly for anything than for the success of their policy. They have cried, and cried in vain. It is not in their power to carry out what they promised. The prophets of Baal cried until midday was passed, and on until the evening sacrifice; but there was neither voice nor anyone to answer, nor anyone that regarded their cry. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the position they are in. They have been crying, and hoping, and praying, and wishing, but no blessing comes down. And Elijah said: Take the false prophets; let not one of them escape. And they took them, and brought them down to the Brook Kishon, and slew them there. And that is what the people ought to do with our false prophets.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). At this late period of the debate, and the late hour of the evening, I shall not attempt a defence of the principles of the National Policy.