

any other principle ever presented to a free people for one hundred and twenty-five years. Its first sponsor on the American continent was the father of the American Republic, George Washington. Was he the friend and ally of special privilege and the enemy of the common people? The second statute that he placed on the statute books of the United States, after it became a nation, was a statute embodying in very pronounced form the principle that the hon. gentleman impugns. Its next prominent sponsor (indeed very, very few opposed it), was the founder of the other great political party in that country, Thomas Jefferson. Coming nearer to our own time, the man who laid the foundations of the present tariff policy of the United States in general form was the man who emancipated the slaves in the United States, Abraham Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln was an adherent throughout his life to the principle that the hon. gentleman attacks. Was he either the servant or the ally of special privilege? Was he the enemy of the common people of his country? Can such an allegation be levelled at Theodore Roosevelt, whose principles were just the same? Can it be levelled against a single one of the sponsors of that principle during the whole one hundred and twenty-five years of American history? This thought is presented for the honest reflection of disciples of the opposite faith.

A number of other thoughts occur to me at the moment, but I will reserve them for a more appropriate hour. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar), however, spent a lot of time on the question of immigration and emigration. He showed that though we did get a good volume of immigration we lost a lot of immigrants to the United States. Well, I draw his attention to the fact that we have not lost very much to Great Britain, so I do not see how he gets very much of an argument out of the emigration statistics.

The hon. gentleman has spoken about abandoned farms in this country. Let me say that I have seen a whole lot of farms that ought to be abandoned, but on which people are struggling along and making a living in some way or other; but I do not know myself of a single farm that is abandoned that does not deserve to be abandoned from the character of its soil.

An hon. MEMBER: Not one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know a whole lot though of that type across the Atlantic, for I have seen them, and I also know that the Prime Minister

of Great Britain lately regretted that between the year 1870 and the present hour four million two hundred thousand acres in that kingdom had gone out of cultivation, and I do not know that he ascribed it to the same cause that, to the hon. member, seems to be the fount of all evil.

A pleasant reference was made to myself by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), whom I am glad to welcome to this House, whom I have always understood to be in actual life not only a farmer but a good one—so good, indeed, that I understand he performed some service for a farming enterprise that is now under my administration. The hon. gentleman thanked me for coming down to his constituency, and ascribed to me the credit of having given him another thousand of a majority. I do not know just how the hon. gentleman figures it out but I do remember this, and I say it without seeking to take any credit to myself—no doubt I was fortunate in the location of the meetings at which I spoke—we were rather busy here in Ottawa at the time of the election and could not get away, but I was able to visit his county. I managed to hold two meetings, one in the town of Woodstock and one in the town of Andover. Both are thriving communities, and in both the hon. gentleman was soundly defeated by a very substantial majority. I am afraid the hon. gentleman placed his gratitude on a rather false foundation, and that he could have found a much better one if he had been inclined to be reasonable. I do not think he would try to tell the House that he would have been beaten by a thousand more votes in Woodstock if I had not gone there, surely he does not think the electors were so badly as that against him. That is not what he had in mind. What he must have had in mind is this: That those who did not hear me, those in the rural parts, resented the idea of any one but a farmer talking in the constituency at all and consequently rolled up an increase of a thousand majority in his favour. That must be what the hon. gentleman had in mind; there is no other legitimate conclusion. If that is the case I am afraid he had better be very careful before he tries to convince this House that what he is supporting is not a class movement after all.

Some reference to me was made also by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould). We are glad to welcome the hon. gentleman here because of the good it will do him. The hon. gentleman devoted some time—I do not know that I gathered his exact point, and if I misinterpret him in