

the natural average rate? In old times, as my hon. friend remarks, there were three causes—bloody war, desolating pestilence and devastating famine. When these three causes, singly or conjointly, afflicted a country, no doubt the actual rate fell below the natural rate of increase. There was also, if I remember rightly, another plague which the apocalyptic writers predicted would afflict the world in future years; over and above these three plagues there would be a plague of a noisome beast, which noisome beast. I am inclined to think the theologians who studied the question carefully, would be disposed to say, was a protective system. Anyhow, here in Canada we have neither had a desolating war, nor a devastating pestilence, nor, thank Heaven, have we had a famine, but we have had a National Policy, and you see what it has done for us. Sir, I take the case of those seven or eight states of the Union which were subjected to a terrible civil war between 1860 and 1870. I take the states of Virginia, Florida, Georgia, Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri, North and South Carolina and Tennessee. In 1860 their population was just about 11,000,000. They had four years of terrible civil war, and in 1870 their population was 12,487,387 souls. In those ten years those southern states, which had been subjected to the worst horrors of war, in which it is known that an enormous portion of the youthful population had perished, where their wealth was almost annihilated, had increased in population very nearly 14 per cent. Sir, in old Canada and the maritime provinces the increase from 1881 to 1891 was just 325,000 on their population of 4,156,000. In those ten years, under the National Policy, they increased 7 per cent, as against the 14 per cent increase in those southern states that I have enumerated. Sir, I think one such fact as that ought to satisfy hon. gentlemen, not, perhaps, that their policy is incorrect, but most assuredly it ought to satisfy them that there is a most urgent need for considering how this enormous loss of population occurs, and how it can be stopped. To my mind, for many years back we in Canada have been exchanging gold for brass, we in Canada have been parting with the very best of our population, the choice and pick and flower of our population, and we have been receiving in return and in part—not altogether—a very miserable equivalent in the shape of some of the scum of Europe. Now, Sir, that kind of thing should not be. I have no objection in the world, I repeat, to anything being done that will bring an honest and good immigrant population here, but, to my mind, that is a matter entirely insignificant compared with the importance of keeping our own people in Canada. One true Canadian is worth any half a dozen imported European immigrants. I would ten times rather see what money we have to spend, for the matter of that, used to keep our own people in this country rather than allow it to

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

be expended for the purpose of bringing, say, 900,000 immigrants into this country, of whom we can only keep 150,000. I do not believe that the hon. gentleman, in the statement he made of my position, intended willfully to misrepresent me, but I am bound to say that when an hon. gentleman in his position has the opportunity of reading and examining a statement which took the shape of a motion made in the House and in his presence, and on which he voted, it would be the part of wisdom on his side to read and examine it, and when he had read and examined it, he then would be entirely welcome to contravene or contradict it. It so happens that, shortly after we obtained those details of the census, I made a motion in this House on the subject, and I do not apologize for taking this opportunity of reading that motion again, for the simple reason that I am prepared to stand by every word of it, and I invite the sharpest criticism of the hon. gentleman, his colleagues and his followers, and his press, on every word put on record, although I was not then in possession of anything like the quantity of facts I now have in support of it. My motion was as follows:—

That it appears from the official returns recently laid on the Table of this House, that the total population of the Dominion of Canada on or about the 1st day of April, 1891, was 4,829,344.

That it further appears from the report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1890 that the total number of immigrants stated by the said department to have settled in Canada from the 1st day of January, 1881, to the 31st December, 1890, was in all 866,171.

The House will remember that the statement is "settled in Canada."

That according to the last census the population of the Dominion on or about the 1st April, 1891, was about 4,324,816.

That the total increase of the population of Canada in the ten years now past was 504,534.

That at the rate of 2½ per cent per annum, the natural increase of the population of Canada during the last ten years would amount to 1,077,531 without any immigration.

It will be observed that I never stated, and I never intended to state, that such a natural increase had taken place. My point, I repeat, was that under ordinary and natural conditions, if the population was not violently interfered with, if an abnormal number of people had not been driven out of the country, the natural increase would have been 1,077,000, and that point I maintain.—

That at the same rate of 2½ per cent per annum, the natural increase of the said 866,171 immigrants officially reported to have settled in Canada between the years 1880 and 1890, would have amounted to 110,432.

That, had the said natural rate of increase been maintained and the said immigrants remained in Canada, the total population of Canada would now amount to 6,404,944.

Then I proceeded to refer to certain statements, which it is not necessary now to read,