found him ignoring the loss of immigrants away again. I further pointed out that he who came and did not stay here by 727,000, and we have found him diminishing the number of Canadian-born, the most important item of all, who have left this country by 175,000. It occurs to me that these are important matters, which the press the people would do extremely and consider a little more deeply than the First Minister has done, and it has the gave; and also that that circumstance occurred to me they put a somewhat new face on all the theories and calculations which the hon, gentleman submitted later as to the per-centage with respect to these years. I will just say this: Apply the same scale of calculation to the exodus which existed between ada between 1871 and 1881-a fact of which I 1871 and 1880 that I have applied to the exodus which I have proved to exist between 1881 and 1891, and you will get this result: The exodus from 1871 to 1881 on a population in 1871 of 3,685,000 amounted to about 337,000 or thereabouts. On the same scale in proportion, that is about nine per cent, while the exodus which has now taken place, making allowance for the death rate, amounts to 440,000 on a population of 4,324,000. It is a little more than ten per cent, so that the fact is that the exodus has materially increased in spite of all the hou, gentleman has alleged, and that without taking into the slightest account, without making any allowance for the 727,000 emigrants who were brought to Canada at the cost of our people and afterwards left us.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

SIT RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the House rose, I had just concluded pointing out three somewhat serious errors into which I conceived the hon. the Minister of Justice had fallen in dealing with the extremely important question as to the amount of the exodus from Canada during the last ten years. I had pointed out in the first place that he had made a very grave error indeed in supposing that the total increase n our population from 1881 to 1891 was 17 per cent, whereas his own census statistics, if he had taken the trouble to refer to them, would have shown him that the increase was barely 11.66 per cent, in other words that he had overestimated the increase by about 230,000 I had further pointed out that he had entirely and completely omitted all reference to that very important portion of the exodus which was composed of the foreign-born people, who, according to the hon, gentleman's own Government statistics-statistics published by a Government of which he was a member—had come into this country, largely at the expense of the people of this country. to the number of 886,000, of which 886,000 it now appears that only 159,000 at the very outside had remained in Canada, and therefore 727,000 immigrants had come to Canada, had settled here, according to the hon. gentleman's Sir Richard Cartwright.

ing the census increase by 230,000, we have reports, had looked about them, and had gone had committed a grievous mistake in underestimating the ascertained facts as to the movement of population from Canada to the United States; that, whereas, he estimated it as 265,000, the proper amount—making due allowance for the death rate during those years—was 440,000 or thereal outs, a number 175,000 in excess of the number waich proved conclusively that the immigration from Canada of the native-born population from 1881 to 1891 had been considerably in excess (on the same system of calculation) of the emigration of the native-born population of Cancould have afforded him ample additional evidence from the municipal statistics of our different provinces. The hon, gentleman and his friends will observe that, if you lose of the foreign-born population 727.-000 for whom you cannot account, and if you lose besides 440,000 of the native population, the total number of the absolutely ascertained loss is made up of these two figures, and amounts to 1,167,000 in round numbers. And now I come to another portion of the hon, gentleman's speech. And here I will say frankly that, although the hon, gentleman has very seriously misstated what I stated, although he has quite misunderstood and misconceived my remarks, I entirely acquit him of any wilful misconception or misrepresentation. He has evidently read the reports of what I said very cursorily, when he said that I estimated the loss of our native-born population at a million and a half. I never thought or said that a million and a half of native-born Canadians had removed from Canada to the United States in those ten years, as the hon. gentleman in his speech distinctly infers that I stated. No such statement was ever made by me, or, as far as I know, by any one on this side of the House. On the contrary. over and over again I had expressed my when the figures of the that, opinion United States census were in my hands. they would probably show a total popuof native-born Canadians in United States in 1890 of about one million. It appears that I slightly overestimated the number. I was informed from the Bureau of Statistics at Washington-though I doubt if the last report has reached the Librarythat the number was 989,000, of whom a certain number were natives of Newfound-I may have been misinformed. land. hon, gentleman states the number to be 930,000, and I should be very glad indeed tofind that the information furnished to me was incorrect, and that we were not quite as badly off as I supposed. But it was stated in the same communication that, making allowance for the natives of Newtoundland, who, of course, are included in the enumeration of the natives of British North America, the increased number of Canadians