

arrived at Port Huron. Now, then, I have seen it stated that the number who passed there was 99,000. How many would have to pass there every day? There would have to be 300 emigrants pass there every week-day of the year, and something over. As a matter of fact, I have investigated the matter, and I may now state, for the information of my friend, the member for Lambton, I find that all the tickets that have been sold and that have been given do not amount to two-thirds of that number. I find that the number of those who proceeded to the west did not amount to anything like that number; not more than two-thirds. I find that the whole number of people who went that way and bought tickets to come back was less by 15,000 than that number. I will be able to lay these figures before my hon. friends, and I will be able to show them what is the state of things; but I would ask, is this patriotic, is it right to send statements like these broadcast and have them published on the other side of the water. As to the number of emigrants we have had in this country, let me tell them that the emigration this year is very much larger, it is more than double that of last year. They are men of means who have come into the country, and a large amount of capital has been brought in. When we speak of the emigration to the North-West, it is true that in the summer the number that has gone there has been less than expected, but it is equally true that we have had a very wet season, and my hon. friend, the late Finance Minister, knows that is one of the causes why people could not get there. Then, again we hoped to have been able to have had a railroad in the interior of the country, that the emigrants might have gone on, but, unfortunately, the wet weather came and the people could not get into the country, and the emigration fell off. I should be sorry to have these remarks of the hon. gentleman go forth in the country, and I am sure they would be sorry themselves that a false impression should be caused by their being circulated on the other side of the water.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I regret exceedingly to be obliged to go into this question to-night, but as I took it upon myself, after full consideration and examination of this matter, to make certain statements with respect to emigration from Canada to the United States, I feel that I cannot possibly permit the assertions of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to pass without comment. I regret as much as, and probably more than the hon. gentlemen opposite, the enormous exodus which has gone on, and is still going on every day, from Canada to the United States. But I say this, that no greater act of folly, no greater act of unpatriotism could be perpetrated than for the Opposition to shut their eyes, or to allow the Government to shut their eyes, to this extremely unhappy and unfortunate state of things. It is the duty of this House, and especially of those members who are on the Committee of Emigration, to probe this matter to the bottom. When I made the statement at the Town of Godfrich that a certain number of Canadians had gone from this country to the United States, I had taken all the pains that could be taken to ascertain the manner in which the United States authorities estimated these people. I say here, on the authority of Mr. Nimmo, the head of the Bureau of Statistics in the United States, that this 99,000 odd who left Canada for the United States in the year ending 30th June, 1880, were persons who had declared their intention of becoming settlers in the United States. I say that the United States Customs authorities do not take cognizance of stray and casual passengers. I have crossed the frontier twenty times myself, and I suppose hon. gentlemen here have crossed it a hundred times, and were they counted in that number? At the proper time and place I will produce statistics from the United States which contain two distinct columns, in one of which are entered all the passengers, and the other including those who formally declare their intention of becoming settlers in the United States, and the

Mr. POPE (Compton).

Customs authorities pass their goods free of duty in consequence. I much fear that when that matter comes up it will be found that the figures of the United States authorities are indeed inaccurate, but most unhappily in this, that they seriously under-estimate the number of those who are leaving the country. Hon. gentlemen, as usual, choose to get up here and make random and reckless assertions, as they did before, without taking the trouble to examine the United States authorities. I venture to say the hon. Minister of Agriculture has not taken the trouble to examine the recent United States returns, and if he has examined them he must know that one of two things is the case, either those returns are falsified, or else those facts I stated on the authority of the United States Customs returns are literally true.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I would inform the hon. gentleman that I sent a man to that very port, and he asked the Collector how he got at the figures. "Why," says he, "I can tell pretty well by looking at the train; I never count them."

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Nimmo, over his own signature, expressly denies that, and Mr. Sanborn, the Collector at Port Huron, over his signature, expressly states that that is a falsehood. I will not say whether Mr. Sanborn is at fault or whether the agent of the hon. Minister is, but I say this, that this matter has been brought to the attention of the Collector at Port Huron, and he has, in the most formal fashion, over his own signature, denied the statements of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture on the authority of his subordinate. Let us look into this matter, let us ascertain from what causes this tremendous exodus from Canada is taking place, and if it appears, as I believe to be the case, that, to a large extent, it is due to the enormous taxation under which sections of this country are laboring, then I say, on their own evidence, out of their own mouths, these hon. gentlemen are convicted of having attained power under false pretences, of having utterly failed of redeeming any and every one of the pledges they made. They told us their dearest desire was that Canada should be for the Canadians, that their hearts were breaking by reason of the enormous depletion of our people, and during the first year their Tariff has been in operation, as my hon. friend has said, the emigration has been five-fold greater than it was the last year my hon. friend conducted the affairs of this country. I am not disposed to protract the discussion on the Address, but I will say that if the hon. the First Minister had designed and invited discussion on the Tariff, he could not have done better than to allude to it in the way he has done in the Speech. What is that paragraph? That

"It will be satisfactory to us to find that the existing tariff has not only promoted the manufactures and other products of the country."

Now, I would like to have the First Minister explain how he promotes other products than manufactures by a tariff—how he promotes wheat, beef, lumber. The hon. gentleman arrogates to himself a particular blessing of Providence on himself. I think he will find it difficult to show that the tariff he has specially designed to cause certain lines of goods to be manufactured in this country, can have any particular effect on the production of those leading articles to the additional production of which this prosperity has been due. Now, my impression is, that the improvement which has taken place is clear enough, and that it is due to causes entirely beyond the control of the hon. gentleman. It was not due to the hon. gentleman that there has been a revival of trade in the United States, owing to which we have been able to sell them a larger quantity of lumber than before; it is not due to his policy that there have been two good harvests on this side of the Atlantic, and two bad or indifferent harvests on the other side. I do not think the First Minister would assert that the National Policy can have effected the growth of cereals or our capacity to sell lumber to other countries. When we are told that the effect of the