

tion, lowering the cost of living and giving more work to our people, while advantageous trade treaties opened up the world's profitable markets to our farm and manufactured products.

The result was a gradual increase in our products and trade, and better living conditions for the farmer and workman. It is therefore not astonishing that we have not the number of unemployed as other countries have, even that of the United States which our Conservative friends delight in praising to us. There is yet much to be accomplished but those who allowed profiteers to hoard the people's money and prevented a general and equitable distribution of prosperity, should not hamper our constructive work.

They are sufficiently guilty, by their exaggerated participation in the war, and wasteful administration, without disparaging the notable improvement in the lot of our labouring classes. Canada is recovering rapidly.

If we read the statements of the various financial and commercial institutions, the time seems far off when cries of distress rose from everyone's lips.

An optimistic note is heard over the entire country the echo of which reaches the humblest abode. Conditions are easier for the workman to earn a living because there is more work and more money, and the farmer by improving his agricultural methods and taking a greater interest in the dairy industry earns more substantial profits. Our opponents admit it, but they discovered statistics showing that there is a migrating flow of our people towards the United States, and the responsibility is placed at our door. They should be the last to mention it because it is under their rule from 1881 to 1891, that Canada lost the greatest number of her sons by the exodus to the United States, and the losses we are sustaining now are but the sad sequel of their poor administration. If they cannot keep their tongue quiet, they should at least be fair and acknowledge this fact.

They should also mention that there exists a natural migration that no one will ever stem. There is a continuous to and fro movement between the two countries; on both sides we meet with visitors, and if there are people who leave us to establish themselves in the United States, there are also some who return to us disenchanted, deceived as they were by the speeches of our opponents, who described to them a country better than theirs. As for us, we conform our policy to our desire of keeping our people, and welcoming back those we have lost. Statistics tell us that we have succeeded, in

[Mr. Auger.]

a large measure. How sarcastic, sir, are the speeches of the leader of the opposition and his followers when they talk of the great problem of increasing our population, and offer protection as a sure cure to all evils! Lighten the burden by putting it on the shoulders of a greater number of people is, indeed, a bright idea which could only see light in a highly imaginative mind. But to state in their speeches that Canada cannot support her present population which is forced to leave for the United States, and in the same breath ask to increase it, without knowing how to keep it in the country, for me, it savours highly of ridicule. If they are sincere and truly believe that our rural or labouring population cannot further exist in our country, why do they advocate that we should spend millions of dollars to bring in other people? They tell us as their leader did, in his speech at the Chateau Laurier, on January 24 last, that immigration comes in the front door and our own people leave by the back door! Did they, however, have the common sense of closing this back door by which escapes the manhood of Canada.

If such are the conditions, and if the tears they shed over those departing are genuine, why not be logical and not state that the money spent to increase our population should be spent in Canada, so as to improve the condition of the Canadian and keep him at home.

It is futile to seek elsewhere for a more vigorous race than ours, and if conditions in Canada are such that the sons of its pioneers can no further exist, it is more than time to cry out: Halt! cease spending the money of Canadians outside of Canada to entice an immigration which will not remain here. Why do they not advocate using all the money spent on immigration to improve the lot of the Canadian?

I read with much pleasure the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. McRae); I would have enjoyed hearing his words on the lips of his leader and friends.

That would be a loyal and patriotic opposition which would stand up and demand that we spend all our money in Canada, for the Canadians, as long as effective means are not found to stem the exodus of our people to the United States. Why not be frank, about it if they are sincere. Why do they have more regard for the manufacturer and British immigrant? Without attacking immigration,—wherever it may come from—and the manufacturers who, after all, help in the development of this country, I think it is ridiculous to increase or keep up a tariff which might