

concerned as to how such a scheme would answer elsewhere. I say Canada is able to make her own precedents, and if she sets an example in this case, she will only do what she has done before on other occasions and successfully ~~there~~. No true Canadian, and no honest workman that I know of, would desire to be dependent on charity whether of the state or an individual if only opportunity is given him to make provision for himself by his own energy and self-denial. It is our happy position that in Canada there is as yet no submerged tenth, and I may add it will be our own fault as a nation if for many a day and many a generation a submerged tenth should come into existence in Canada. I say, God forbid that such a thing should ever happen; and I say moreover that this measure would contribute both directly and indirectly if the people choose to avail themselves of it, to prevent any such contingency, and that it is infinitely better for us to spend, if need be, a few thousands a year in order to encourage thrift and self-respect amongst our people, than perhaps, as they may have to do in England, to waste millions which at best will pauperize a great many. I may add, too, that it is well even for us to remember that in old times—we have the lessons of history to teach us—the Roman people never lost their liberty till the people were fed by the state. I have no sympathy with the class of maudlin philanthropists who would reward the idle sensualist at the expense of the honest, frugal and industrious. And if honourable gentlemen think that this is too hard a saying I may remind them that there was once a great saint who was also a great philosopher who lived about 2,000 years ago, and who has left his views on the subject