

pointing out the huge amount of fertile land available for immigrants ; and I continued :-

That it appears from the above-recited facts that the difference between the actual increase of the population of Canada and the natural increase, together with the immigrants officially reported to have settled in Canada, is 1,568,000.

That during the last ten years the actual taxation of the people of Canada has been enormously increased under the operation of the existing tariff.

That the deplorable state of things disclosed by the above-mentioned returns, imperatively commands a radical change in the policy and methods of government followed by the Administration.

That was my statement. It was not in the slightest degree a statement that there had been an emigration from Canada to the United States of 1,500,000 native-born Canadians, as the hon. gentleman states, but that, if you put together the loss of immigrants who come here, the ascertained loss of native-born Canadians, and make a reasonable allowance for the extent to which we have diminished our natural increase by this exportation of the best part of our population, then the loss would amount to the figures I have stated, which I conceive to be a totally different thing from the statement made by the hon. gentleman. The question very naturally arises in the minds of those of us who have taken pains to study and consider what these things mean, what reasonable or possible remedy can be suggested for this condition ? Sir, we do not contend, we never contended on this side of the House that the huge depreciation in the value of property in farms, in towns and villages to which I have referred, was wholly and entirely due to the protective system or enormous taxation ; but we did contend, and we do contend, that it is one important factor, that it is one cause, and a very important cause, of the loss of population, the depreciation of property and the general distressed condition of a very large and important segment of the people of this country. My hon. friend, in his place as leader of the Opposition, demands as his right that the Government, in the face of these facts, shall state what they are prepared to do, and will apply, if they can, a remedy to this state of things ; and in applying a remedy, that which lies handiest and readiest is a large reduction of those duties which press most heavily on the agricultural community. What can be more reasonable, more fair or more righteous than to adopt that course ? The hon. Minister of Justice alluded to the fact that my friend the leader of the Opposition did not introduce the question of reciprocity. For what purpose ? Have not hon. gentlemen opposite told us, did not the Minister of Justice tell us, when he made his speech in Toronto, that the remedy we had suggested, the remedy of continental free trade, the remedy of throwing down the barriers between ourselves and the United States, which, in my judgment, is the only means which can give great and durable prosperity to Canada is impossible. I do not mean to say that we cannot exist without it,

that is another question. I do not mean to say we may not have a moderate amount of prosperity ; but under no circumstances or conditions can the resources of Canada be developed as they should be developed, under no circumstances or conditions can this frightful exodus be stopped, under no circumstances or conditions can we make anything like a full use of the great resources we possess until in one form or another. I am not particular as to what form, the markets of the rest of this continent are thrown open to us, and we are able to trade on even terms with our friends and neighbours of the United States. But why suggest this to hon. gentlemen opposite ? A year or two ago they said it was no use to talk about reciprocity, because we could not get it. What is the statement now ? It is that hon. gentlemen opposite could get reciprocity, but they would not have it. They could have obtained it easily on the lines I have laid down, but those ultra-loyal gentlemen were so afraid of discriminating against British goods they would not dream of having it. If there ever was a practical discrimination against British goods, it is made by their own tariff ; if there ever was a tariff framed in servile imitation of the United States tariff, it is the tariff under which we now live. The hon. gentleman will not give us any information in regard to the policy of his party, or explain that policy, or give us the least hint as to the mouldering branches which it is proposed to lop off. I cannot tell the House, I need not tell hon. gentlemen, for they know it already, what the policy of the leader of the Government is. If ever there was a policy of looking to Washington, it is the present policy ; if a party ever followed a policy of looking to Washington, hon. gentlemen opposite are doing it. When the American Government repealed their sugar duties, straightway our Minister of Finance did so. When the Government at Washington shook their finger and told them to repeal the export duty on logs, the duty was removed. No sooner do our friends impose tolls in favour of the port of Montreal and the Americans object, than steps are taken to remove them. Like my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier), I complain of no reasonable concession, of no fair concession being made to the people of the United States. I am prepared to endorse every word he said as to the policy and expediency of dealing in the broadest and most generous fashion with that great people ; but, like him, I condemn hon. gentlemen opposite because they yield to threats what they refuse to a fair request. That is not the way for a small state to deal with a large one, or with any state, nor is it the way to make Canada respected or to obtain favourable treatment at the hands of the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I well know are afraid to declare what they will do until they know what the party which is coming into power in the republic is going to do. Their hope is, and in one sense it is my hope,