

to be perfectly crushing, to the ex-Minister of Finance, which, he said, came from the Idylls of the King. Just a moment before, the hon. gentleman had been discussing a chapter in Locke, where that great philosopher had been discussing the wonderful and unseen influence of the association of ideas. The Minister of Trade and Commerce must have been under the spell of that influence himself, for instead of his poetical quotation coming from the Idylls of the King, it came from a poem known as 'The Grandmother.' And, it did, Sir, appear to me eminently fitting that the old lady, who in younger days, had dispensed sweets to these gentlemen opposite, when their house was not nearly so well furnished and their larder was not nearly so well supplied as it is now, should feel that his position as grandmother had been usurped by a much younger—old lady I was going to say—but a much younger gentleman in the person of the Minister of Finance, and that he, himself, in his old days, had largely been forgotten and crowded out. Would the members of the government permit me to give a quotation from Tennyson, too, which, I think, will apply to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, who, simply for the purpose of receiving the emoluments, hangs on to a position which he himself said some years ago should be abolished, because there was no earthly use for it. He has many sharp turns to make. He has many times each day to stultify himself, but with Tennyson he consoles himself.

'Tis the jingle of the guinea
Helps the hurt that honour feels.'

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce never forgets 1874 to 1878. He was bound to go back to that period, and did go back to it, and gave us some interesting information. He said: 'It is true we had hard times in Canada between 1874 and 1878, but there were hard times all over the world then, and I tell hon. gentlemen that the hard times in the world from 1892 to 1896, were like the hills of the Gatineau, compared with the Rocky Mountains, as compared with the hard times between 1874 and 1878.' Well, Mr. Speaker, I took occasion to look up Bradstreet's record to see how correct the hon. gentleman was, and I see that in the United States, between 1875 and 1878, the average liabilities of failures was \$205,307,283, and between 1893 and 1896, the average was \$239,479,510, or \$34,000,000 a year more between 1893 and 1896, than between 1874 and 1878. That settles the fact conclusively as to which was the more disastrous period financially upon this continent. And, how did Canada stand comparatively in these periods? From 1875 to 1878, Canada had failures to the extent of an average of \$25,947,750 per year, while from 1893 to 1896, she had only an average of failures of \$16,100,902, or a decrease as

compared with 1874 to 1878 of no less than nine million per year. Take the worst year, if you will, of these two periods, and you find that in 1878, under hon. gentlemen opposite, the failures in Canada totalled one-tenth as much liabilities as the failures of the United States, and in 1893, they had sunken to one-thirtieth. Does it need any other demonstration upon which to found the statement of a financial newspaper made 'that the one pleasing sight on this American continent, in that terrible time of depression of 1893, was Canada, under the policy of the Conservative party, standing upright, like a chimney amid the ruins of a burnt factory.'

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce made a strong point, which was cheered by hon. gentlemen opposite, when he said that the trade of Canada is to-day, per head, actually twice what the trade of the United States is. Does the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce remember the years when he said Canada was being bled white, that it was being ruined, that it was travelling rapidly on the road to financial destruction? The trade, per head, of Canada in 1893, was \$50, while the trade, per head, of the United States, in that year, was \$25—the same ratio of 100 per cent more in Canada than in the United States, the same proportion of excess as the hon. gentleman now boasts of in 1900, as being the result of the policy of the present government.

Now, the hon. gentleman returned to that favourite subject of his, the exodus; and what he did not say upon it was said by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), when he came to deal with it. And the argument of the Minister of Customs was: We are doing splendidly; the settlers' effects coming in are increasing, and the household goods we are exporting are decreasing. Now, let us take 1899—the settlers' effects that came into Canada in that year were valued at \$2,183,861, and the household goods which were exported were valued at \$963,625—and, by the way, where there is \$963,625 worth of household goods going out, there must be some exodus—the difference in favour of Canada being \$1,220,236. Now, what about 1894, which, the Minister of Trade and Commerce says, was the worst year in our record? The settlers' effects which came in that year amounted to \$2,665,893, and the household goods which were exported were \$940,709, a difference in favour of Canada of \$1,725,184, as against \$1,220,236 in 1899. The cry of these gentlemen as to the exodus was the cry of office seekers. It never had any sense in it, and it injured Canada severely. I am only quoting these figures, Sir, to show how senseless was the bellowings of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his ilk when they grasped at this cry to injure their opponents—not caring how much injury was done to the country.