

to the prosperity at present enjoyed by the Dominion of Canada. Hon. gentlemen who have already spoken have referred to this prosperity, and admitted that at the present time we enjoy it in a very large measure. While agreeing with that view, I will go so far as to say that, compared with the prosperity prevailing all over the world, Canada stood as well in the bad years of 1892 and 1893 as it has stood in the good years of 1897 and 1898, that is, compared with the rest of the world. What was the condition of affairs in 1892, 1893 and 1894? We went through a tremendous crisis which swept down almost all the banking institutions of the United States. The United States suffered extreme distress. The same distress, although not so poignant, was felt in Great Britain and in fact all over the commercial world. Although we were not wholly exempt from that wave of depression, while we felt it to some extent, yet I contend we came out of that ordeal at that time and stood well compared with the rest of the world. My hon. friend the leader of the House says that we have to take immigration as an evidence of existing prosperity. I am not going to deny that the influx, in very considerable numbers, of settlers is an evidence of prosperity. The prosperity that we enjoy may be one of the reasons that induces them to come, and it is certainly very gratifying to know that we are receiving a considerable number of settlers from abroad. But I have looked a little into the public documents and find no evidence before me to warrant the belief that we are receiving at this time, or that we have been receiving within the last year for which we have any particulars, a very much larger number of settlers than we received even in the years which we all admit to have been bad—1892, 1893, 1894, and so on. My hon. friend beside me, the hon. leader of the opposition, remarked that he was not able to turn up in the Trade and Navigation Returns, any item of settlers' effects going out of the country during the last year. I have been a little more successful in that respect. It is not found under the heading of "settlers' effects," but "household effects." When they come into the country, they are called "settlers' effects;" when they go out of the country, they are adroitly called "household effects," but they mean precisely the same thing. Settlers' effects in the customs re-

turn, either going in or coming out, is almost the only statistics we have to show what the movement of population has been. I find the settlers' effects coming into Canada from the United States for the year 1898 were of the value of \$2,334,457, a very respectable showing, indeed, and that in the same year the household effects going to the United States amounted to \$886,622. Going back to 1894, I found that in that year the settlers' effects coming into Canada from the United States were \$2,665,893, or nearly \$300,000 more than is shown by the Trade and Navigation returns of 1898, about which we hear so much, and I find that, comparing the household effects going to the United States in these two years, there is practically little difference. In 1894 they were \$940,000 and in 1898 they were \$886,000. Therefore, as far as the customs returns furnish us information—and I do not know of any other source of information that we possess—we have nothing to show that the flow of population into and out of the country has been materially different in 1898 from what it was in the year 1894. I have taken these two years for comparison, because we know that in 1894 there was a depression all over the world, and in 1898 the boom of prosperity had set in, not only in Canada but in other countries as well. Now, with regard to the flow of population and the prosperity enjoyed in the country, I am not one of those who have ever believed that it is a very bad thing that some of our people should go out and share in the enterprises of the great world beyond. I am not at all satisfied that this is a bad thing. We rather pride ourselves on the distinguished Canadians abroad. We like to give a president to the first National Bank of Chicago, and a principal to Cornell University. We are proud of the young men we send out and that out of those who go abroad a goodly number find responsible positions in the countries of their adoption. I therefore think that the statement in the first paragraph of this address, which says that there has been almost a total cessation of the exodus of our population, has been made without any substantial foundation upon which to rest. I happen to know that from the province in which I live a good many of our people have gone, and they are still going. Crossing on the ice boat the other day two young men were