

better derived than from those to which I have referred. If hon. members will take the trouble, as I have done, to analyse the receipts of our customs, they will find that after taking out the duties imposed on wines and liquors, on fancy goods, silks and other luxuries of that character and on the class of goods to which I have just referred, the balance remaining is very small, amounting, according to my calculation, to not more than one dollar per head of the population. Of course we cannot arrive at the amount with absolute certainty. But if we make the most liberal allowance possible, the tax on those articles used by the great mass of the people and the duty paid on them does not amount to more than \$1.25 or \$1.50 per head, at the outside of our population, and any reasonable man will admit that that is not a tax which can be considered burdensome even to the poorer classes of the community. I wish before I close to offer a few observations in answer to another line of argument adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is the argument which had been used in regard to the movement of our population, by which hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted to show that the country has not been prosperous and the National Policy has failed. They pointed to the fact that the immigrants who have arrived in Canada have, to a large extent, disappeared; that some of them may have returned, but that others have gone southward across the line. But the census returns show that taking into consideration the immigrants that have come into the country during the last ten years, and the natural increase of population, the population is not so large at the present time as we might reasonably expect it would be. Hon. gentlemen from these facts jump at the conclusion that the country has not been prosperous and that the National Policy has proved a failure. I desire to endeavour to show that these conclusions are not justifiable from the premises, and that the course of reasoning is illogical. In the first place, I should like to call the attention of the House to this fact, that the growth, progress and prosperity of any country depend, not so much on the number as on the character and habits of its people, and that those countries which have had the largest immigration, or are most densely populated, are not the most progressive or at the present time the most prosperous. To go to the old world, Great Britain is a country which, for many years, has been the great commercial and manufacturing centre. She has received few additions to her population from abroad, but she has sent out constantly a stream of emigration from her shores. Germany, next to Great Britain, has had the largest emigration of any European country, yet no one will say that Germany is not a great, thrifty and prosperous people. Norway and Sweden have had the largest emigration of any

European country in proportion to population. These countries are sparsely settled, yet they compare favourably, so far as the ratio of progress and prosperity goes, with other European countries where the population is more dense and from which there has been no emigration. I do not, however, claim that from those countries we learn the most useful lessons. The most practical lessons may be learned by a study of the census returns of the United States, where the conditions more closely resemble ours. The United States for many years received the largest number of immigrants of any country in the world. A high authority estimates that two-thirds of all the emigration has for many years gone to the United States. During the ten years covered by the last census the immigration to the United States amounted to upwards of half a million annually. This foreign element, the census shows, is scattered largely, almost entirely, through the northern and western states. In the North Atlantic Division, which includes New England and New York, the percentage of foreign population, according to the last census, was upwards of 22 per cent. In Rhode Island, where it was the largest percentage, it reached upwards of 30 per cent. In the North Central States, it was upwards of 18 per cent. In some Western States it averaged from 30 to 40 per cent, and in North Dakota, where it was the largest, it attained 44 per cent, almost one-half of the entire population of the state. In the Southern States the proportion of foreign element was small. In Texas, where it was the largest, it was less than 7 per cent; in almost all the other Southern States it was less than 1 per cent. The point in these statistics to which I wish specially to direct attention is, that notwithstanding the large immigration which has been added to the natural increase of population, and notwithstanding the population of the northern and western states has been increased by this large foreign element, the centre of population of that country has remained undisturbed during those ten years. Indeed, for the last one hundred years it has remained on the same parallel of latitude. In 1790 the centre of population of the United States was in the neighbourhood of Baltimore. In 1890 it was in the neighbourhood of Columbus, in Southern Indiana. These are practically on the same parallel of latitude. It has removed westward during these hundred years upwards of 500 miles, but during all that time it has moved but a few miles north or south of the same parallel of latitude. The study of these figures show, that while there has been a movement westward of population in that country, there has also been a movement to the south, and this movement may be accounted for in various ways. In the first place, there are the wealthy, independent classes who go south in search of rest or health. Then there is the class who

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).