

immediate neighborhood 5,000 or 6,000 or perhaps 7,000 or 8,000. The city of Halifax, which has complained of a large loss of population, has, nevertheless, according to the Census, increased as compared with 1871, while St. John has decreased, the meaning being not that Halifax has done well but that St. John has done much worse. Let us take the city of Ottawa. The Finance Minister, in that triumphant tone which he knows well how to assume, and which some time borders almost on insolence, declared that to-day there are no laborers in Canada out of employment, and that no workmen gather round the Parliament or Departmental buildings clamoring for employment. The Minister of Railways made the similar assertion, that to-day there was ample employment, because the National Policy had stimulated all industries, and had not merely stimulated industries but had created wealth and resources that had never before existed. The hon. Minister of Finance said that to-day you could not find any of those placards "to let" in any of the windows of the towns of Canada, that the houses were everywhere occupied, that new establishments were everywhere going up, and signs of prosperity and abundance were everywhere visible. A bright picture, but is it a correct one? Would that it were correct, but how could any man walk through the streets of this town and have that opinion? Let him go through Sussex street and he will find "to let" staring him from almost every window, shops closed, and others doing a business that can hardly be a paying one. I am told that in Ottawa to-day there are 600 or 700 houses of one kind or another absolutely unoccupied, and that a few years ago there was not a single unoccupied house to be had. Where are the people that clamored around this building some years ago demanding employment from the Government, and who were led to believe that the Government could find them employment, and that it was the special province of the Government to see that the seasons were what they ought to be, the harvests abundant, and business prosperous? That was the teaching of the hon. gentlemen opposite. They had the Workingmen's Association in this city, and gathered a number of those people together, telling them that if the Tories returned to power a brighter day would dawn, that all would find employment at high wages and be happy and contented. Where are those people to-day? Do they and their families present the cheerful and happy appearance predicted? They have all disappeared. They remained in the country until the National Policy came into operation, when finding it did not give them the employment expected they left the country.

Mr. PLUMB. Where have they gone?

Mr. ANGLIN. To the United States.

Mr. PLUMB. They have a high Tariff there.

Mr. ANGLIN. But they left here after we got the high Tariff. They left because, notwithstanding the Tariff, there was more depression felt in Ottawa than ever.

Mr. PLUMB. How could they live in the United States?

Mr. ANGLIN. The change of times for the better in the United States, as times have changed in Free Trade England, brought about additional employment.

Mr. PLUMB. But the United States had a high Tariff.

Mr. ANGLIN. Prosperity had commenced in the United States and it has continued to the present day. That prosperity is reflected in this country, and it is to it that Ottawa especially owes what prosperity she now enjoys, because of the higher value of lumber. But this prosperity was not due to any change of Tariff. There was a change of Tariff in the United States and England as well as in Canada, and if the change of Tariff in Canada has done such wonders here, the change in the United States and England should have had a similar effect in those countries. We know that under the

Tory Administration of Disraeli, depression was felt throughout England. We know that in the iron districts of Cleveland one furnace after another went out of blast, and the people were in great misery. If it were not a too contemptuous term to use they might have been called shivering wretches, so much did they suffer. Other districts in England were in as bad a condition although those wonderful Tories were in power, and notwithstanding the glorious foreign policy of the Tory jingoes. Mr. Gladstone returned to power and proposed a change of Tariff—an important change, as the hon. member for Centre Wellington would say. He took the duty off malt and substituted for it a duty on beer by the barrel. Immediately after things began to improve, and where formerly there was distress there is now abundance of employment and prosperity. According to the reasoning of hon. gentlemen opposite, the change was due entirely to the change of Tariff taking the duty off malt and placing it on beer. There was also a change of Tariff in the United States about that time. Just as the years of adversity were fading away, the duty was taken off quinine, and the country immediately became prosperous. For no other reason, as far as the Tariff or fiscal policy was concerned, did the depression disappear and a change for the better take place, except that the duty was taken off quinine. This may be the *reductio ad absurdum* of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, but it is just as justifiable to attribute the change for the better in England and the United States to the changes in their Tariff as it is to attribute the improved condition of Canada to our National Policy. But to return to the workingmen of this city—to such a depth of poverty were many of them reduced, that when they were driven in despair to leave the country, some had not the means to do so, and they had to apply to the Corporation for assistance. In 1879, when the Tory Government were in power, when the Tory sun was high in the heavens, and hope beat strongly in every breast, and a new stimulus was given to trade, the city of Ottawa paid \$2,050 to assist these citizens to go to some other place where they could get employment. It was necessary to give \$1,150 in the year 1880 to help the very poor of Ottawa to go elsewhere to seek employment, and in the year after another sum. In 1881, that blessed year in which the country was so prosperous, if we believe the hon. gentlemen opposite, in which there were no shivering, suffering, ill-clad people—in that year Ottawa was forced to pay \$760 more to enable the poverty stricken to go away to earn a living elsewhere. In all, since the accession of the Tories to office, \$3,960 has been paid to those who were so poor that they could no longer get bread enough and had they not been so aided would have had to crawl out of the country. It has been said that there are no poor at Montreal—that it is a great, prosperous city, and that the National Policy has done wonders for it—that thousands additional of men are employed,—and we are told that Montreal ought to be prosperous above all other places. It was my misfortune to be compelled, some time ago, to spend six or seven weeks in Montreal, and being what the Minister of Railways would call of an enquiring turn of mind, passing up and down the streets I looked for evidences of the wonderful prosperity of which all the Tory papers and Tory orators had been telling us. There is always in that city a busy multitude to be seen on the main streets; but walking through the back streets, I observed in many a house the placard "to let," although the Finance Minister stated all such had disappeared. In the districts where the workingmen dwell, I saw many empty houses, and in the more fashionable quarters, including Prince of Wales Terrace, St. Catherine Street, I also saw "house to let" in more than one place. Elsewhere, everywhere I turned, appeared similar evidences of the same kind. On enquiry I found that houses recently let were bringing astonishingly low rents, and the owners reducing them to get tenants.