

of an hour of our time in proving how much more imaginative he is than I could possibly be. The hon. gentleman, in calling attention to the reorganization of the Government, and in the criticisms which he made upon it, naturally saw, as the only subject of admiration in connection with it, that characteristic which he and his party lack above all others. He saw that we were strong in numbers, and he apparently viewed the reorganization of the Government entirely from that reflective mood into which the observation of the condition of his own party would naturally lead him. Now, in commenting on the observations which have been made on this side of the House as to the condition of the country, the hon. gentleman described us as going about the country endeavouring to preach the contrary of what we know to be the facts as to the condition of the country. Well, we have taken advantage of every opportunity to state to the country what the facts, the records of the day, prove to be its condition. We have never, so far as I am aware, discussed this question without showing what the public records prove in that regard; and while the hon. gentleman has replied to us in several places, I have never seen that in any place he has cited the public records to refute a single statement we made, if I except alone the fanciful theories which he builds upon the census. But if we take the volume of trade of the country, if we take the increased industries of the country, if we take the mileage of railways or their business, if we take the business done in the banks and other institutions of the country, as pointed out by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) this afternoon,—if we take the record of these and simply unfold them to the people of the country, we are accused of making a hue and cry about a false and fancied prosperity. Gentlemen addressing public audiences immediately afterwards declare that this is all delusive, but do not venture to wrestle with the figures any more than did the hon. gentleman this afternoon. I have referred to the hon. gentleman as having built fanciful theories upon the census, and I think he has. He is entirely mistaken, however, in supposing that I had apologised for the results of the census figures on the ground of the inaccuracy of the census. What I did say was precisely the answer which the hon. gentleman's argument invites this afternoon, and that is that a comparison between the two sets of figures exhibited by the recent census and by that of ten years ago is a most unfair one. It is unfair because the basis of the census was practically changed in 1891, and the conditions and regulations under which it was taken, though they tended to greater accuracy, are deceptive for the purposes of comparison because they left uncounted in the population tens of thousands of people who would have been counted under the regulations of the previous census. Yet the hon. gentleman insists upon a severe comparison between the census of 1891 and that of 1881, and

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

supposes we are apologising for the discrepancy on the ground of inaccuracy of the census of 1891. I do not assert that the census of 1891 was more inaccurate than that of 1881, or that the census of 1881 was more inaccurate than that of 1891. I say they were taken under different conditions, which reduced, apparently, the numerical population of the country, very greatly to the disadvantage of the subsequent decade. The hon. gentleman himself was mistaken for a moment in stating what the ratio of increase had been during the previous decade. He stated it was something about 19 per cent, whereas, as a matter of fact, it was 17½. That is merely by the way, however, and was no doubt a slip of memory. There is greater fault to be found with the hon. gentleman, when he makes the assertion that from the so-called and fancied prosperity of this country hundreds of thousands of persons are fleeing year by year. If that had been the fact, the census of the last decade would have shown an exodus of two millions of people for the ten years, at least. The hon. gentleman, not satisfied with the facts contained in the census, although his friends have been quoting them everywhere in condemnation of the Government's policy, multiplies the actual exodus tenfold in order to make an effective speech to the House. I think that if the hon. gentleman is in a position to compliment me this afternoon on the acquisition of a new gift, I am in a position to credit him with enhanced power of slighting facts and slurring over arguments in order to make an address which will be effective and brilliant, but not based on sound reason or justified by the public records of the country. The hon. gentleman made a facetious allusion to the National Policy and myself, in connection with some observations which I made upon it. I must take leave to except altogether from the assumed right of the hon. gentleman to define what the National Policy was and is. He called it a gospel. I would not like that the apostle of that doctrine should be a gentleman who does not believe in the gospel at all; and therefore I dissent entirely both from the hon. gentleman's definition of what the National Policy was and his right to define it. When I addressed the audience in Toronto at the meeting to which he refers, I was alluding to the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party as having been national in a far wider sense than the sense of any mere customs tariff arrangement; and, whether I am right or wrong, I claim that we are justified in putting before the country that it was the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party from its formation, as it is its policy still, to unite and build up this country; and when the union of the provinces was accomplished the first step in that great task was taken and the task has been carried on ever since by the policy of that party, which has put on the face of this country every structure worth preserving, and which has put on the statute-book almost every enactment worth continuing. But I do