

struction of railways are a real debt upon the people of Canada—have enormously increased likewise; and that private indebtedness, as represented by moneys borrowed by our loan companies and invested in mortgages, has likewise increased enormously? I would like the hon. gentleman to tell us what his estimate is of the indebtedness of our people to outsiders on all these various scores. One of his colleagues, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), some years ago submitted a calculation to this House, according to which he estimated that we owed annually \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 of interest. I am not disposed to quarrel with that calculation. I am very much disposed to think that since that time our annual indebtedness for interest has considerably increased. But if it be correct, if we have to pay \$30,000,000 in the shape of interest to foreign creditors, and if you add to that the enormous amount of money we are likewise obliged to pay, not into our treasury, but in the shape of taxes to manufacturers, the hon. gentleman will see that we have very good ground for saying that the people of Canada at this moment are subjected to a burden far too heavy for them to bear. Now, Sir, in the meantime there are certain facts as to which there is no shadow of doubt. With the census returns now in our hands, there is no shadow of doubt that there has been in these ten years that I have alluded to, an enormous loss of the native-born population of Canada, of the very pink and flower of our population. There has been likewise, if there be one word of truth in the statement formally laid on the Table of the House by the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a member, a most enormous loss of the foreign imported immigration. And here I may pause for one moment to say that I, for my part, am willing enough to welcome any honest immigration, but I think, Sir, that the Government and the people of Canada will do well, looking at the enormous loss of their own people, to hesitate before they encourage much more foreign immigration. I have noticed, and noticed carefully, that the foreign immigration which has come to Canada of late years shows a most distinct deterioration, and I believe the same thing exists with respect to the immigration to the United States. In old times, no doubt, the immigration was composed of a very good class of people, as a whole. The difficulties that attended leaving their own country, and the expense of coming here, operated as a sort of natural selection, and a tolerably good class of immigrants came out. In fact, in the old days they would compare perhaps as favourably with the majority of the people from which they came as do the Canadians, I regret to say, who now go to the United States, compare with the majority they leave behind in Canada. But that is all altered. The improvements of transportation make it very easy to shunt upon us an inferior class of

immigrants, and, no doubt, a very large number of those brought to Canada, under the auspices of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, have been of a very inferior class. There is danger here to the national life. We are suffering a double moral depreciation and degradation. First of all, these hon. gentlemen deprive us of the cream of our population, and then they water the skim-milk that remains. Some gentlemen on their side I dare say, could advise scientifically as to the proportion of water which should go into skim-milk. If you add to this the enormous increase in the real taxation of the people, and by that I mean not only what goes into the Treasury, but what goes out of the pockets of the people, can the hon. gentleman wonder that there is discontent and agitation from one end of the country to the other, more particularly when he and I know that all over Canada to-day a very large class of the very best of our population are daily and hourly being degraded from the position of free and independent landowners to that of mere tenants at will or hopelessly mortgaged men? Let us compare for a moment the progress we have made in this last decade with the progress we made in other decades. The hon. gentleman made a very great point of the enormous increase which the census shows in manufactures. Well, I have also taken the trouble to look through the census returns, and while I am glad to see there has been a considerable increase, I am sorry to be obliged to tell the hon. gentleman that he is utterly mistaken, and is misleading the House gravely when he declares that there is a greater proportionate increase in the most important respects between 1881 and 1891 than between 1871 and 1881. I take these census returns and look to two very important particulars. I look, in the first place, to the number of men employed. The increase in that respect amounted to 44 per cent; the increase between 1871 and 1881 amounted, I believe, to about 39 per cent. All the alleged gain that has been obtained has been a relative increase of some 4 or 5 per cent. And I turn to another item, to which the hon. gentleman directed special attention, the item of the amount of money employed. I do not consider that that is a very favourable showing. It requires to-day, \$353,000,000 of money to produce \$475,000,000 worth of goods, according to the hon. gentleman's census returns. Now, in 1881, it required \$165,000,000 to produce \$309,000,000 worth of goods. Consequently, whereas before we were able to produce by the employment of \$1 of capital nearly \$2 worth of goods, now it requires \$2 worth of capital to produce \$3 worth of goods—a very distinct alteration, and an alteration for the worse in that important respect. And so on for a very considerable number of other important matters. As I have told the hon. gentleman, I do not consider that, in a country like Canada, there is anything to boast of in the fact that there is a reasonable natural increase from year to