

only a feeble and unfounded cry that they are raising, that they will get into power, but the country will be glad to accept them and have them effect the saving. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) raises a skeptical laugh, and well he may, for I am certain that the challenge will not be accepted by the hon. member for Queen's. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford, after his manner and the manner of his friends, answered part of his own argument. In his speech, he declared that he had never denied that it was not in the power of the Government to adopt a fiscal policy which would avert disaster. Disaster may come whether you have a free trade policy or a protective policy. Then, what is the meaning of all the arguments that are used by members of the Opposition? They try to make out that the country is in a ruinous condition. The hon. member for South Oxford says that the country has been bleeding away—that is his language—for years and years. Speaking of the present prices of property, he says that, if a careful account were made up of the country to-day, it would be found infinitely worse than it was sixteen years ago, that it is not nearly so wealthy as it was, and that this is true especially of the older provinces. I would not like to take up the time of the House with statistics, but hon. members will find that all they have to do, in order to answer the hon. gentleman, is to take his own words, when he declares that no policy can be adopted which will be certain to avert disaster. But, without going into the figures, let me ask the hon. gentleman to take the assessment of Kingston, the city where he lives, the assessment of Toronto, the assessment of Montreal, the assessment of towns and cities in the lower provinces—to say nothing of the value of farm houses and homesteads. Take the assessment of Winnipeg, which city the leader of the Opposition visited not long ago. In 1878 the assessment of Winnipeg would amount to two million dollars, while to-day it is \$22,000,000. The assessment of Brandon which did not exist in 1878 has an assessment of about three or four millions. Portage la Prairie—I speak now from memory—has an assessment of about two and a half millions. Then, you can go further west, to Regina, Calgary and Vancouver. The assessment of Vancouver—a place that did not exist in 1878—is about \$19,000,000. And yet the hon. member would try to make out that Canada is worse off to-day, with all this added wealth, than it was in former years. But, even supposing the hon. gentleman's statement to be true, he tells us himself that no policy can be guaranteed to avert disaster. But what does the hon. member do? He actually went into a discussion of the deficits, 1858-59-60-61-62-63. What, in the name of heaven, the deficits in these years have to do with the question before the House, it was hard to understand. Then, taking up more time, he dealt with

some rubbishy Act of the time of Edward IV., with a view of making some doleful, pointless point with regard to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). But at this period he had to call a halt. He reminded me of a certain English statesman making his first speech. He was a heavy young man, the son of a duke. He has attained to better things than were then expected. He spoke very leisurely and only for half an hour, and in the middle of his speech he actually yawned. When asked what caused him to yawn at such a time, his answer was that he was so plaguey tired of his speech. The hon. member for Oxford seemed so tired of his speech that he had to call a halt and take a rest. After having four days to fit himself, he came once more to the scratch, but, I am sorry to say, proved to be in no better condition than at first. He went into the question of shrinkage of values from 1875 to 1878. As a criminal comes back to the scene of his fatal deed, fascinated thereby, the hon. gentleman came back again and again, fascinated by the doleful memories of the deficits of 1876-78. Now, I will ask the House to bear with me while I treat of one other matter. The hon. member for Winnipeg said he would not deal with the reduction of the Mounted Police, but would leave that question for me to deal with. I may say that I differ with the Government in reducing the number of Mounted Police. The Minister of Finance has reduced the vote by \$155,000, and he has reduced the number of men. If we had known in the west that there was to be any reduction, I think we would have shown the Government that it was not a wise course to take. Anyway, as soon as we knew that a reduction had taken place, we made certain representations to the Government, and no further reductions were made. Now, I want to point out to the House why, in my estimation, it is not desirable in the interests of Canada to make further reductions, and why I cannot endorse the changes that have been made. We have in the North-west, 26,439 Indians, making more than 5,000 families, and that would give you some 10,000 fighting men. These are scattered all over the North-west. You have 646 at Fort Pelly; 272 at Cote; 225 at Key; 149 at Kee-see-kouse. These Indians occupy three or four large reserves north-west up in Eastern Assiniboia, fifty or sixty miles from the railway. There are few settlers, comparatively, although the country is a splendid one for settlement. There is good land as far east as Lake Winnipegosis, and north to the Porcupine Hills. There is a vast country to the north of the Saskatchewan, including the Carrot River District, and the valley of the Red Deer river. Now, with these 646 Indians in a country forty or fifty miles from a railway, it is evident that you require policemen. I think there is a police