

year. Does the hon. gentleman pay so very bad a compliment to his own policy as to think there would be no natural increase at all? Let us look at the rate of increase and compare it with that in the mother country, and let us return to that test which I have always pointed to as offering the best possible guarantee for a nation's real progress. I pointed out the other evening that in old Canada, that is to say in the five old provinces, our total increase during the last ten years had been barely 7 per cent. I turn to the returns for England and Wales, and I find that while, with our almost unlimited amount of vacant land in Ontario and Quebec, at any rate, and also some of the Maritime provinces, all we increased in that decade was 7 per cent, in England from 1861 to 1871 the increase was 13 per cent, and from 1871 to 1881 it was 14 per cent, and for this last period the increase is as nearly as possible 12 per cent. So that, practically speaking, the increase in England and Wales—an old country, a country which loses a great many of its population by emigration—has been in some decades twice as much as that which took place in our old provinces from 1861 to 1881. I notice that when the hon. gentlemen opposite are confronted with the facts of the census, or with the facts of the enormous depreciation of property in town, village and farm lands, their course has one merit—it has always been perfectly consistent. I will recall to the minds of my hon. friends behind me the numerous occasions in which, during past years, I have challenged the accuracies of the hon. gentleman's statements as to the growth of this country, and I ask them if the course of the Government was not on all occasions precisely the same. First of all, there was an impudent denial of the fact. That was usually followed by frantic abuse on their part, and on the part of their supporters and their hiring press, of myself and the other gentlemen who brought those unpleasant facts to their notice, and when the facts became too clear to be gainsaid or denied, then the hon. gentleman took refuge—in what? In the assertion, and often the very incorrect assertion, that it was a matter of no consequence, because in some hole or corner of the United States, in some little state of the Union, a similar state of things prevailed. Sir, a physician who, when asked to cure a patient of a wasting disease, would tell the patient that he knew of no remedy, but was able to inform him that there was a number of other people similarly attacked, would not be the kind of man I would like to employ. The hon. gentleman devoted, if I recollect aright, about an hour, or maybe an hour and a quarter to enunciating the policy of the Government. The policy of the Government! Well, Sir, the policy of the Government might have been defined in much shorter metre. The policy of the Government, Sir, as enunciated by the hon. gentleman is, briefly, to fill a tub to the whale. The policy of the

hon. gentleman reminds me very forcibly of an anecdote which I once heard of an American gentleman who, at an early period of this century, was sojourning at an English country house. This was at a time when the great American nation had not been educated on the subject of tips, and this frugal party was seriously exercised as to what he ought to do. So he took one acquaintance aside and asked him gravely, "What is the least sum I can give without appearing mean?" I think the hon. gentleman's Budget has been framed entirely on these lines. The spirit of this frugal Yankee has transmigrated into my hon. friend, and his one end and object at present is to ascertain: "What is the least I can do for the unfortunate farmer without appearing mean?" I cannot congratulate him, but it is the day of small things, and I suppose we must be grateful. And perhaps there may be something in the instalment plan on which the hon. gentleman intends to proceed. Sir, if ever there was a case in which the saying 'Parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus' was verified it has been verified by the hon. gentleman this afternoon. Two and a half mortal hours the hon. gentleman consumed in telling us, first, that the Government did not know what to do about saw-logs; second, that the Government will allow us to import oil in tanks instead of in barrels; and, third, that the hon. gentleman will make the duty on binding twine 1 cent instead of 2 cents. But, Sir, that is not all, that is not all by any means. Over and above all this, Sir, the hon. gentleman has been good enough to say that a grand progress is about to be instituted. Is it to be by caravan or by Jamaica car, Mr. Speaker? Four Cabinet Ministers—no, two Cabinet Ministers and two apprentice boys will peddle old taxes for sale about the Dominion. Old taxes for sale! That positively is the policy of the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman really means it, he has been monstrously injudicious. I recollect perfectly well how the vials of wrath were poured out on my devoted head because, some eighteen years ago, in the course of a speech made by His Excellency, I ventured to hint in the mildest way that within a month or so there would be some tariff changes. Sir, it seemed to me that the heavens and the earth were coming together. What I had done was unconstitutional; I was destroying trade, paralyzing manufactures. But the hon. gentleman proposes during the whole year, if he really means what he says, to unsettle all trade, to unsettle all manufactures. Nobody is to know where he stands until the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have completed their pilgrimage and until a sufficient number of the old taxes have been sold. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman does not mean it, if all this is simply a device to gain time, if there has been a private arrangement with certain protected manufacturers that they need not disturb themselves, that this will all come out