

in power, and recent events have fully exemplified that principle.

The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) says that we are rich because we have a surplus of \$4,000,000, and the people are prosperous. Mr. Speaker, what is this surplus? It is the balance unexpended of the money that is paid into the treasury by the people, that is the surplus. Does that prove that the people are prosperous?

Now we come to something that the hon. member for Bellechasse could speak of as within his own knowledge, and it is upon this point I wish to quote him more particularly that in the portion I have already read:

I know that in my section of the country the people are not prosperous. I represent a rural constituency, and I know that a great many houses are closed and their owners have gone to the States. Look at the city of Quebec, where I live. Quebec West has diminished in population, and the two other divisions of the city have very slightly increased. Is that a sign of prosperity? Is it because a few contractors receive public money, is it because a few hundreds of manufacturers make millions of money? Is it because some of the public employees supplement their salaries with large bonuses and testimonials and presents of all kinds—is that the reason that the people are prosperous? Surely, you will not pretend that the million of people who have left this country are all fools, and that, if they had been prosperous here, they would not have remained. Here is a fact that confronts you at first glance. The census returns prepared by the officials of the Government prove to us that over a million of people have left this country. And why? Is it not because they could not live here during the ten years just past, when the hon. gentlemen have been telling us: We are happy, we are prosperous, Canada is rich, Canada is increasing in wealth and in population? The contrary has been proved to us.

This is a quotation from an hon. gentleman now supporting the Administration, from an hon. gentleman who stood up here last evening and for a long time endeavoured to prove that the National Policy, as administered by the hon. gentlemen had been a success. What I have quoted is not given as a matter of opinion, but as a matter of personal knowledge, as a matter of proof within his own knowledge—and, being a legal gentleman, he knows the value of proof—that a million of people had left the country in consequence of the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite. And so out of the mouths of their supporters as well as from the official reports with which they furnish us, this claim is demonstrated to be, like the others, false and misleading.

The whole line of policy adopted by hon. gentlemen, in their efforts to retain power has been discredited. I will not allude to the extravagant prophecies made as to the settlement of the North-west; I will not allude to the extravagant claims for the various undertakings to which they have committed Parliament, but I will show, if possible, from the public records to what an enormous extent they have violated the promises upon

Mr. FLINT.

which they obtained power, promises which they could have carried out consistently with their other declarations. It is admitted that the defeat of the Liberal party was caused by the depressed condition of the country, by the denunciations of their opponents, and the extravagant promises those opponents made of reform. The hon. gentlemen came into power with an enormous majority to carry out the terms upon which they claimed the indulgence and confidence of the people. Very shortly after they obtained power, the predictions of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) came true; the depression, which had begun to pass away while he was still in power, passed rapidly off; the labours of the husbandman were abundantly blessed by Divine Providence; general confidence was restored, the markets of the world improved, and our export trade in the great natural products of the country, the products of the farm, the forest, the fishery, and the mine, found profitable sale in the mother country, and in foreign lands. The returns gave the people of the country considerable money to spend in the improvement of their condition. In addition to this, the increased taxation which was at once imposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, placed in the exchequer large sums of money, available to be expended upon various public works. In addition to that, the enormous borrowing powers of the Government were exercised without stint, and money from this source flowed in to the exchequer of the country. The consequence was that there was a large expenditure by the Government, and a considerable increase in the expenditure by private people.

Now, the claim has been made, and is constantly made, that it was the National Policy that brought about the largely increased exports of the country. It seems to me that if ever there was a proposition which bore upon its face its own condemnation for absurdity, this is the proposition. It is an accepted principle of economics that, in regard to the great natural products of the country, the markets of the world, the demand of the market in which the surplus is sold, furnishes the criterion of profit or loss. And Canada sold enormous quantities of these natural products. Was the increased price of fish and the increased draft of fishes from the sea, running to many millions of dollars' worth, the result of taxes imposed upon imported manufactures? Was the increased product of the soil, and the increased price of our agricultural staples caused by the tariff which hon. gentlemen opposite forced upon the people of this country? Certainly not; this improvement would have happened if hon. gentlemen had never existed. This improvement would have happened under any Government; and I think it has been abundantly demonstrat-