

trovert the arguments I advanced on a recent occasion in opposition to some of his statements. With respect to the exodus, I want to call the attention of the House to this fact: I am prepared to prove that so far from stopping the exodus, the exodus during the last ten years was double, and more than double, the exodus between 1871 and 1881, and it was three times as much as the exodus which took place in Mr. Mackenzie's time. I have taken the trouble to examine not merely our own statistics, but the United States' statistics, and I have ascertained from them that the total annual exodus in Mr. Mackenzie's time was probably not more than 32,000 all told, from 1874 to 1878, and that it certainly did not exceed 42,000, taking into account the entire foreign-born immigration which came to Canada during that period. In the five years beginning 1874 and ending 1878, 148,000 immigrants, according to our own official returns, are stated to have come to Canada. Of those, 12,000 a year were required to make up the death rate, to keep up the number of immigrants to Canada at its former strength, and even if we lost all the remainder they would merely aggregate 88,000 people. We have the American statistics for 1874-75-76-77 and 1878. For 1874 and 1875 they group all the Americans together, north and south. For 1876-77 and 1878 they give correct figures. In 1876 the total Canadian-born immigrants from Canada to the United States amounted to 22,471; in 1877, 22,116; 1878, 25,518. So far as it is possible to ascertain, the number was about 25,000 in 1874 and 1875, making a reasonable deduction for the number of immigrants from Mexico, the West Indies, South America and other countries included with the Canadians who went to the United States. I do not allege that that was due entirely to the policy of Canada at the time, for the simple fact that during those five years emigration to the United States had almost entirely ceased, as any hon. gentleman can see if he examines the United States' statistics. But how does that compare with the emigration under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite? As I have said, the maximum immigration in Mr. Mackenzie's time was very little over 40,000 souls, putting together the foreign-born immigrants who came to Canada and the native-born Canadians who left. What was the number under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite? Our own census returns prove to a demonstration that we have lost 440,000 of our own native-born population, and the hon. gentleman's own statistics prove, unless those statistics are a lie, a fraud and a sham, that we have lost of foreign immigrants 727,000 more. Put these two figures together and you will find the loss to Canada of native-born Canadians, by far the most valuable class, and of foreign immigrants, amounts to a total of 1,167,000, being at the rate of 116,000 per annum during the last ten years, as against, in Mr. Mackenzie's time, an ex-

treme number, an over-estimated number, of 40,000 a year from both those classes. Those hon. gentlemen made every hustings ring in 1878 with their declamations as to how, if they were only permitted to enjoy the control of this country, a home market would be provided in every town and village for everything the farmer could raise. Our villages were to become towns and our towns were to become cities, and our cities were to become something hardly ever dreamed of in this country before. We were to have at our farmers' doors, markets which would consume every vegetable, every cereal, and every head of cattle and poultry that they could possibly raise. I do not think the hon. gentleman dare prate to the farmers of their home market to-day. They were to restore the balance of trade. Well, to my poor judgment, that was a silly proposal, but what is the fact? Do hon. gentlemen want to know the figures? Why, since 1878, the gross balance of trade is \$308,000,000 against us, an average of more than \$20,000,000 a year, and that was the way the hon. gentlemen fulfilled that promise. The hon. gentlemen were to enrich the people, they were to raise the value of farm products; but the present Finance Minister, having obtained a little more wisdom than his predecessors, tells us that no Government can raise the price of farm cereals. I appeal to all my hon. friends. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite themselves who took part in the election of 1878, if, from one end of Ontario to the other, and, I believe from one end of Canada to the other—although the price of farm products were double then what they are now—I appeal to them and ask if the cry of hon. gentlemen opposite was not that they could and would raise the price of everything that farmers had to sell. They were to fill the North-west with population. Well, Sir, if ever there was a miserable exhibit on the face of the earth, it is the exhibit which is made to-day in that fine country, under the policy of these hon. gentlemen. Why, at the present time, we have positively not got one family to the square league of the fertile lands of the North-west. We have spent \$100,000,000, more or less, in the last dozen years, and I doubt, Sir, if we can be shown to have added 10,000 families to the population of the North-west during the last dozen years, by reason of that enormous expenditure. But, above all, they told us that they would obtain reciprocity; as Sir John Macdonald put it: reciprocity of trade, or reciprocity of tariffs. That, also, I must deal with hereafter. It would take me altogether too long at this present moment to do justice to the strenuous efforts made by these hon. gentlemen, and by the Minister of Finance in particular, on two memorable occasions, to obtain reciprocity for the people of Canada. Now, I notice three fundamental errors in the speech of the Finance Minister, errors which affect his whole policy and the whole policy of his Government and his party. That hon. gentleman lays down, or did lay down, as a