

will not at all justify or explain the terrible falling off that has taken place in the population of the country. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote some figures from the census, and I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to them. I will take the five eastern provinces. In Ontario, during the decade, 1871 to 1881, the increase of population was 16.06 per cent. in the following decade it fell to nine per cent and a fraction. In Quebec, the increase during the first decade was 14 per cent, and during the second decade it fell to 9 per cent and a fraction. In Nova Scotia, the increase in the first decade was 13 per cent, and in the second decade it fell to 2 per cent and a fraction. In Prince Edward Island it was 15 per cent during the first decade, but in the second decade it fell to 1.01 per cent. In New Brunswick, the province from which the hon. member from Kent (Mr. McInerney) comes, there was no increase whatever during the second decade. These figures are appalling; these figures cannot be explained away by any quibbling as to the manner in which the census was taken. These figures show that the whole natural increase of population was swept away. Swept away! How swept away?—by what? There has been witnessed no such calamity as occurred in the days of old, when the Angel of Death was sent to the land to smite the first-born; and yet the result is the same as if every child born during the said years had been smitten in the arms of its mother. But I know that hon. gentlemen opposite say that the National Policy is not responsible for that condition, that there was an exodus before the National Policy, and the exodus has continued under that policy as well. Sir, this apology which is offered for the National Policy is the strongest arraignment and the most severe arraignment that ever was presented against it. There was an exodus, it is true, before the National Policy was adopted. But have hon. gentlemen opposite forgotten their own history? What was the object of the National Policy? Was not the object of the National Policy to put a stop to the exodus? Do not hon. gentlemen opposite remember their own speeches of thirteen or fourteen years ago? Have they forgotten the gospels of their own policy, if I can apply such term as “gospel” to their policy. However, in order that there should be no misunderstanding on this point, let me again bring back to the attention and defective memory of gentlemen on the other side, the resolution which is the very basis of the National Policy, a resolution moved by Sir John Macdonald, while he was in Opposition, and which was to this effect:

That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy which by a judicious readjustment of the tariff will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion.

That such a policy will retain in Canada, thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment now denied them at home.

This was the foundation of the National Policy, and at a later date, Sir John Macdonald, in a speech delivered at Parkdale, justified the principle which had been laid down in this resolution. Thus he spoke:

Here we are not only suffering depression in every trade and industry, but our people are leaving the country to seek employment in the mills and manufacturing of the United States. Was it not a crying shame that though this country had a fertile soil, a healthy climate, a strong and well educated people, and good laws, 500,000 of our own people should have crossed our borders in those years and taken up their abode in the United States, because they could not find employment here for their skill and energy and enterprise, in consequence of the false policy of our rulers.

That was the object of the National Policy, and now we have the result. The object was to stop the exodus, and the result of the National Policy has been the increase of the exodus by hundreds of thousands. In the face of this state of things, what is the conclusion? The conclusion must be for every thinking man, that we have been following a wrong course; that we must retrace our steps, and that we must reform a tariff which has produced such sad results as this. But, Sir, according to gentlemen on the other side, everything is at its best in the country, and they are pleased to portray the present state of affairs in glowing terms. Trade has increased during the last year, it appears, and there is no limit to the exultation which this fact has caused to hon. gentlemen opposite. Yes, during the last year our importations actually reached the figure of \$127,000,000; that is to say that in the year 1892 the importations into Canada have not quite reached, but are very close to, the figures at which they were in 1873 and 1874. We are now coming back to the position which Canada occupied in the matter of imports twenty years ago, and this is a cause of rejoicing for gentlemen on the other side. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) rejoiced a moment ago over this fact, but he should have known that this is against the National Policy. The National Policy has not done its duty, because if it had done its duty, as it was promised it would, there would be no importations into this country. We would manufacture everything in Canada; we would not be dependent upon the United States nor upon Great Britain; but Canada should live in itself, like an oyster within its shell. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the National Policy has not done its duty. On the other hand, we are told that the National Policy has developed to an enormous degree the manufactures of this country. Well, if we take the figures of the census, we will see that it has done a great deal; but, for my part, I make a great difference between certain census returns and certain others. Taking the enum-