

Mr. FOSTER. The same old story.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Aye, which you have never yet answered and never can. The Minister of Justice was good enough to treat, I won't say with levity, but apparently with some indignation, the allusions which were made by my hon. friend beside me to these same census returns. I have observed that the use of the census statistics has upon hon. gentlemen opposite very much the same effect that the application of holy water is said to have upon a certain personage. It is a test they cannot escape and therefore it is a test they hate and abominate. I will candidly admit that up to the present time I have felt that the conduct of the hon. gentlemen in dealing with these same statistics has been such as I cannot altogether approve, and it is possible that I have been somewhat too warm at times in expressing what I thought of their conduct in this respect. Sir, I have altered my mind. I am inclined to think that in dealing with the method in which these hon. gentlemen have treated the census statistics I may have been too exigent, and it is to the Minister of Justice that my conversion is due. I have recently had an opportunity of perusing the statement made by that hon. gentleman to the people of Toronto with respect to the census. It is a statement of very great importance, a statement which was very recently made, a statement which was made under very peculiar circumstances, a statement which is undoubtedly entitled to very great weight, and I will, therefore, Mr. Speaker, take the liberty of placing it on your records. This was no ordinary deliverance. This was the first official statement made by the Premier of Canada. It was, I may say, his first official manifesto to the people over whom he was to rule. It was made in a very public way and in a very public place; it was made with all his colleagues surrounding him, and it was made in the chief city of the chief province of Canada. The subject was one which was not new to the hon. gentleman. Not merely was it one of first-class importance in itself, but it was a subject which had been often discussed in this House, and it was a subject which, for certain reasons that I will presently allude to, was one which ought to have especially attracted the attention of any hon. gentleman hailing from the Maritime Provinces, and particularly of an hon. gentleman who came from a county, which showed such a record as the county of Antigonish. Now, Sir, we will see what the hon. gentleman did say:

I admit the exodus still. There are various kinds of exodus, ladies and gentlemen. There is the Cartwright exodus, which reaches the tall figures of 1,500,000, and he soared above that even and claimed that a good many more men were lost from the Canadian population until somebody turned his own calculation about and applied it to the United States, and showed him that according to his mode of calculating the exodus, there had been an exodus from the United States of 6,500,000. There is the kind of

exodus which the leader of the Opposition described a few evenings ago as an exodus so great that we were unable to keep the beggarly 5,000,000 of people that we have in it. Ladies and gentlemen, while the population has grown in the last decade 17 per cent, and has reached nearly 5,000,000 of people, it has never quite reached that mark yet, and to talk about being unable to keep in this country the beggarly 5,000,000 we have is to talk what that great leader described a few seconds afterwards as mere trash and buncombe. What is the exodus? The facts have been ascertained within the last few weeks from the United States records. They show that the whole population of the United States, Canadian born, is 980,000.

I think the figures here are 980,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 930,000, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is for the States alone, not for the United States. There is a distinction. I think the hon. gentleman will find it is 980,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I believe 930,000 to be correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. However, it is a matter of little difference at the present time. It goes on to say:

How many of these have we lost in the last decade, and how many in the decade before? We have lost in the last ten years 265,000. That is a thing deeply to be regretted; but, ladies and gentlemen, the loss in the decade before was far greater, not in numbers, but in percentage. While in the decade before we had increased our exodus by 50 per cent, during the last decade it has been pulled down to a little over 36 per cent. But the assurance with which our opponents declare that the National Policy is to be blamed for having an exodus at all is something appalling to the intellect of Canadians.

As I say, Sir, the hon. gentleman has converted me. I will admit candidly that when I first read that statement, it appeared to me that it was an exceedingly dishonest statement, but when I read it a second time more carefully I discerned a saving stupidity about it which inclined me to take a greatly more charitable view of the situation. I perceived that this was one of the cases which, all divines agree offer great excuses. Here there was the "crassa ignorantia," which largely diminished the culpability of the party making the statement—I am not quite sure that I might not say the "crassissima ignorantia," and I am prepared to give to the hon. Minister of Justice all that freedom from responsibility which properly attaches, or can attach, to any gentleman who talks on a subject in perfect ignorance of the facts. Nevertheless, it is my duty on the present occasion to call the hon. gentleman's attention—not at all in the way of alleging that he willfully misstated anything, but in the way, if I may venture to say, of correction—to certain very extraordinary mistakes and errors which the hon. gentleman has fallen into in this remarkable statement. For the satisfaction of the House I may say that I have not the slightest intention of reviewing all the minor mistakes in the hon. gentleman's speech. I am afraid it would take from morning until dewy