

from the day he entered political life down to the present, and the manner in which he impressed the great organ of public opinion, the *Toronto Globe*, when he sat on this side of the House behind the leader of this Government, is worth recalling. His calculations, after careful revision, were then pronounced, by perhaps the ablest man that ever conducted that journal, amusing in the highest degree, and he was told to stick to the figuring business and keep up his amusing character. He has done so. He has sustained the character wonderfully well. What could be more amusing than his attitude in this debate? Fancy the hon. gentleman standing as a financial critic and attacking the Budget Speech in this particular, that there was no estimate made for a contingent liability, that the Government of the day had not come down to Parliament and said: We are fighting tooth and nail, a claim made against the Government for a large amount; we are disputing absolutely any liability before the arbitration, that matter is now *sub judice*; but so fearful, so faint-hearted are we in the action we have taken, that we ask Parliament to provide a sum of money to pay a claim we utterly repudiate and disavow. I repeat the hon. gentleman does not occupy a position which entitles him to hurl this unpleasant charge, to use a mild term, across the House. It will be necessary for me to remind the House that he has been all his life, a rather long political life, a man of two ideas, whether as Conservative or Reformer. I would point out to the recollection of hon. gentlemen, that as far back as 1865, when he just entered political life, he started out with those ideas, and to his credit, if consistency be a credit, he has maintained them down to the present day, with a slight exception, and that was when he was permitted to act as Finance Minister. During those short four or five years in that long career, those two ideas were suppressed, and they gave place to what I believe, in my own judgment, were much more creditable ideas to him and much better for the country. Those ideas were, and they will certainly be recognised by all who have followed him in his later day speeches:—Fear and the exodus. He began in 1865, to argue the necessity of Confederation in order to prevent a terrific exodus from the old Provinces of Canada, and to prevent the absorption of these Provinces into the American Union. These were the ideas which he propounded and by which he endeavored to terrify the people, so as to make them firm believers in Confederation. And what have you seen to-day, what have you noticed in years past, and, in fact, ever since that hon. gentleman, with many of his party, have been driven desperate by defeat after defeat? You find them using the same arguments, and referring to the same exodus, which they used at that time to frighten the people of Canada into the opposite course, now to frighten them into the American Union or into such close relations with that country as would break up Confederation, annihilate our national existence, and place us at the mercy of our neighbors. At Ingersoll, and even in this House, the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to point out—though I am glad to know, or, at least, I believe, he had not much support from either side of this House—that England was unable to protect this country against the United States or any other foreign country that might assail us. He endeavored to place in the minds of the people the idea that we should make any bargain we could with the people of the American Union, in order to save us from absorption, as he put it. He went on again to argue as to this question of fear, and he used almost the same language as he did in 1865 on that subject, though then it was with the opposite view. If the House will permit me to make good the point I have taken, I will give a sample of the arguments the hon. gentleman used when he was holding the opposite opinions to those he now holds, and I advance them to show how true it is that he is a man of two ideas, and that he has made no change in the

style and method which he adopted in order to induce the people of Canada to agree with him. In 1865 he said:

"I must again revert to the condition in which we found ourselves during the last few years, and I ask every hon. member to answer for himself whether it was one which it gives him any pleasure to look back upon? Was it pleasant for us, Mr. Speaker, a young country without one penny of debt which has not been incurred for purposes of public utility—was it pleasant for us, I ask, to find our revenue yearly out-running our expenditure in the ratio of 20, 30 or even 40 per cent. per annum? Was it pleasant for us to know that some of our once busiest and most prosperous cities were being depopulated under the pressure of exorbitant taxation? Was it pleasant for us, inhabiting a country able to sustain ten times the present population, to find capital and immigrants alike fleeing from our shores, even if they had to take refuge in a land desolated by civil war? Was it pleasant for us, Sir, the old colony of England which has ever vindicated its attachment to the Empire in fair fight, to know that our apathy and negligence in taking steps for our own defence was fast making us the by-word to both friend and foe?"

That is the language the hon. gentleman now uses in order to induce the people of this country to take the very opposite step from that which they took after those arguments were addressed to them at that time. Not only in 1865, but in 1878, his arguments were almost altogether based on these two points—fear of the United States, and the exodus of the people of Canada. As I have said, he came into power for a short time, and in that time he used as much ingenuity as he now uses in the opposite direction, to show that the exodus was imaginary, and that it was not as great from Canada as it was from the Eastern States of the American Union. That is what he tried to convince the people of during that painful period of our country's history. When Parliament assembled in 1882, the great questions were those of free trade and protection, and these were the arguments he used at that time. So it was in 1888. After the year 1887, when he took the sharp and short turn in regard to the National Policy, you find that he used then, and he now again uses, the arguments which he previously used on the other side. In regard to the question of population, which exercises the hon. gentleman so much, I want to remind him, and to remind the House, that there is a great responsibility resting upon the shoulders of the Opposition for a large portion of the exodus. These hon. gentlemen have endeavored to convince the people in this country, as well as intending immigrants, not only that our land laws are hard and bad to live under in the North-West Territories, but, day after day, they make the fiercest possible assaults, not only upon our institutions, but upon the possibility of our being able to carve out for ourselves an independent commercial and national existence on this continent. Coming from a large Opposition with a large following in the country, these arguments from so many ingenious men, and many able men, must have their weight and must affect the amount of immigration. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was able to remind my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson) that, in his constituency, where he had a considerable amount of influence, seventy men had left within a few months. I believe that all those who accept the hon. gentleman's arguments must necessarily leave the country. I shall not give my own words as to the other side of this question, but I quote from an American review an article written by a man of whom the Maritime Provinces have reason to be proud, Prof. Schurmann, a man who has given his attention not only to matters educational, but who takes a live interest in his country's welfare. In that article he met the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford and went into the question, and in a very able review, he cited the statistics of the two countries to show that, a century ago, the population of Canada was one-twentieth that of the United States, that fifty years ago it was one-eleventh of that population, and he estimated that, in 1890, in spite of their enormous gains in immigration, our population will be one-thirteenth of theirs; and he contended that, as the best