

occasion when a question came up for discussion touching professional philanthropists, I remember also that I spoke inadvertently and somewhat slightly of that valuable class of men. Sir John took me up at once. Professional philanthropists, he assured me, were an exceedingly useful set of people. He, himself, always liked to have one or two professional philanthropists in his cabinet. They were useful, he said, for the purpose of keeping up the average of respectability, which, he remarked—and I entirely agreed with him—was sometimes quite a desideratum; but he went on to observe, and I remember the words well—possibly the hon. gentleman may have heard them—that he had noticed that men who went in to get a living by making other people better were apt, in course of time, to require extensive moral repairs themselves. Now, far be it from me to say that the hon. Finance Minister is in need of extensive moral repairs. I deprecate any such inference being taken from my words. Since he has become Minister of Finance it may be that his views on moral questions have broadened and widened considerably; but I am free to say that I believe him to be quite as pure-minded now as when he entered Parliament. But, as Sir John observed, the reason of this little defect in professional philanthropists was that virtue had gone out of them; and it did appear to me, after listening to the hon. gentleman's speech, that he likewise had come to the conclusion that virtue had gone out of the National Policy, and that some other device must speedily be sought for the purpose of circumventing people for their own good—for their own good, you will understand, Mr. Speaker—or else his seat and the seats of his colleagues were imperilled. Now, Sir, one thing at any rate is clear from the declaration of the hon. gentleman. By his own express statement and admission, which I will allude to more at length later on—and let me say it was one of the most remarkable statements I ever remember to have heard or read of a Minister of Finance making on a similar subject—the whole fiscal policy of the Government is now up for review, the whole fiscal policy is to be examined from the bottom up, for the hon. gentleman's declaration meant that and nothing else. We have had fourteen years of the hopeful experiment of endeavouring to make ourselves rich by increasing our taxes. What has been the result of that experiment? Sir, there is, let me tell the hon. gentleman, a very widespread feeling that the whole National Policy has been from first to last an egregious fraud. There are men to-day in the street and in the market place, in the shop and on the farm, wherever men are gathered to-day, all Canada over, who are recalling the predictions and the promises by which they were induced fourteen years ago to adopt this same National Policy, and they are comparing those promises and those predictions with the ascertained facts which confront

every one at this moment. It is not my purpose to enter minutely, at all events, into all the petty minutiae with which the Minister of Finance was obliged to fill a large part of his speech; but there is one rough and ready test which every man, learned or unlearned, can apply, which I have always felt and always said was a test worth a hundred thousand or a hundred thousand thousand of all those petty percentages and all those little quibbling details which have been presented to the House, if you want to ascertain whether the country is prosperous or not. If a country is prosperous, people all over the world will be glad to go there; they will be glad enough to stay in such a country, and they will be loth to leave it. That is a rough and ready test, I grant you, but it is one which every man can apply, and the truth of which no human being who knows anything of the position of the country will ever venture to dispute, and that test before I sit down I propose to apply to the hon. gentleman's arguments. We have to-night sundry fallacies to deal with, we have sundry, I will not call them falsehoods, but statements without foundation in fact to expose, and sundry conspiracies, I fear, to lay bare. Let us take up the long list of broken pledges by means of which hon. gentlemen opposite carried the country against Mr. Mackenzie and his Administration in 1878. Sir, I remember well, perhaps the Minister of Finance does not, because his parliamentary life is rather short compared with mine, how the people were told that give those hon. gentlemen the right to control the destinies of Canada and they would stop the exodus, they would provide a home market for everything our farmers could raise, they would restore the balance of trade—they laid great emphasis on restoring the balance of trade in those days—they would enrich our people, they would raise the value of land and raise the value of farm products (but the hon. gentleman has got new light on that question since that time) they would fill the Northwest from end to end with a teeming population, and, lastly, they would obtain reciprocity with the United States. The bare recital is enough. All those pledges and promises may well match with Sir Charles Tupper's famous declaration that in a few brief years, and ten years have elapsed since then, we would export 640,000,000 bushels of wheat from Manitoba, and on 31st December, 1890, \$58,300,000 would be paid into our treasury, as profits from the sale of our public lands, and the Canadian Pacific Railway would not cost the people a sou. I shall make a short review, and a very short one, of the way in which those promises have been fulfilled. I regret not to see the hon. First Minister in his place, because the First Minister's view and mine with respect to the exodus differs slightly, and there would be given an opportunity on this occasion for the hon. gentleman to redeem the pledge he partly gave that he would review and con-