

known, an exodus which has gone on from 1878, but in a diminishing degree, as the figures prove and as people well know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Give the figures.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will please allow me to make my own speech in my own way. It may not be so good a way as my hon. friend's, but it is the only way in which I can do it. I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend's intelligence immediately apprises him of these facts which I have stated, but will he go on to say that there is any reason why the exodus should be so great under the circumstances which have existed since 1878 as they were under the circumstances which existed between 1875 and 1878? Let us ask a few questions. Why do people leave this country and go to another? Let us go one step further, and ask the question: why do people leave the eastern states of the United States and go to the west? There has been this displacement of population; he knows it as well as any one on this side, and he knows the cause of it as well as any one on this side. Why has there been this constant outgoing of people from the north Atlantic states towards the western states for a period of ten or fifteen years to such an extent that the north Atlantic states, nine in number, as shown by the very census which my hon. friend has been quoting, have been completely stationary in the last decade, so far as the rural population is concerned, and have made but small comparative gains in the population of the cities and towns? Is it because they have been cursed by a National policy? Is it because they have had large duties on their imports and have been burdened by taxes? Is it because they have had the added burden of a war? Are these ample reasons, or is there another? If the reason is that they have had this policy of protection and this burden of taxation, is the hon. gentleman fair or reasonable in asking us to cure the exodus from this country by adopting a tariff which, according to his own reasoning, has caused the exodus from the other country? But is there not a wider and a deeper reason than all these for the displacement of population from east to west, from the country to the city and town, in this country as well as in the United States, to be found in the general evolution of society, the change in industrial pursuits, different social circumstances and different modes of living? I can tell my hon. friend what he knows, as many men do, that that displacement of population from east to west in the United States has been due to the opening up of new, wide and productive lands in the western country, and the consequent competition that took place under unequal conditions, aided by the extraordinary facilities for transporting traffic which have been developed during these last ten or twenty years,

and which have made the burden of freight but a feather's weight in the competition; so that men who wished to farm left the eastern states, where competition was starving them out, and went on the wide and fertile farm lands of the west, where they could compete under better conditions in the pursuits of agricultural life. That is one reason, and my hon. friend knows it. There is another reason. Whether it is right or wrong, whether it is to be approved of or disapproved of, it is a fact, nevertheless, a fact which you find in England, in the United States, in Canada, and in many other countries in the world—a fact which is patent to everybody who reads—that there is a disposition in these latter days to go from the country to the town, to leave agricultural work for industrial and professional pursuits. This is one other reason for the depopulation of the rural parts of the eastern states, and for increases in the population of the towns. Are these causes confined to the United States of America, or do they also obtain here? I do not go into these matters any more fully; I do not talk about the different modes of farming, the great advantages that have resulted from the use of labour-saving machinery, and all that. These questions have been discussed by thinkers and writers these last ten years, and are familiar to every gentleman in this House. But there are these two causes which I have spoken of which are at the bottom of this depopulation of the rural districts—the influx into the cities and towns, and the migration from the less favoured parts of the country for agricultural purposes to the broader and wider areas, in this country, in the United States, and in other countries as well. Now, these are reasons which are well known, which are reasonable, which any one can assent to. But to say that there has been this exodus from Canada, and that it has been entirely due to the impolicy of the present Government in imposing a protective tariff on the country is a “non sequitur”; it is something which remains to be proved, a mere coincidence, and not something that comes in the relation of cause to effect. It must always be remembered that up to a few years ago Canada had no wide areas of land to which that part of her population which was leaving eastern farms and looking for larger farming facilities could go; so that they went where others were going from the eastern states, to the broad lands in the western states; and once a nucleus is formed everybody knows how quickly it draws to it, and what a far-reaching power it has in attractiveness. One member of a family went out years ago to the United States north-west and settled there; others members of his family follow him; kindred that have ties with them become acquainted with their doings and their progress there; they are also attracted to the same country, and the stream which at first is small grows larger and larger. It was during