more to say on this subject, and I cannot possibly conclude by that time, I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, to call it six o'clock. (Loud and continued applause.)

The House took recess.

SPEAKING AFTER RECESS.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce—Mr. Speaker, when the House rose, I had been pointing out the extraordinary discrepancies which had occurred between the census returns of 1891, for the Province of Ontario. I think that both sides of the House will probably agree with me in this: That when you find that the municipal census of Ontario in the organized districts shows some 70,000, or nearly 70,000, more population than the Government census does, and when you find that an addition of 40,000 families has resulted in the addition of nearly 68,000 to the population of Ontario in ten years; I think that both sides of the House will agree thus far in believing that a prima facie case has been made out that there has been a gross error in either the census of 1891 or the census of 1901. So far I shall probably get the assent even of honorable gentlemen on the other side. As to whether that error occurred through the default of the enumerators of 1891 or the default of the enumerators of 1901 may be a question. For myself, while I entertain no doubt of the main fact, that is to say, of the discrepancy which exists between the two censuses of 1891 and 1901 in Ontario, and while I think that the presumption is very strong indeed that the error arose on the part of the enumerators in 1891; I am quite willing to admit that that is a fair subject for argument.

CONFIRMATORY EVIDENCE.

I have a few points to bring before the House in that connection before I proceed to the other divisions of Canada. It came to my knowledge between 1881 and 1891 that the exodus from Ontario had been enormous. I will give the House three cases all within my own personal knowledge which go to show how very widespread that exodus was. In 1887 or 1888, I made inquiries from the editor of a newspaper which had a considerable circulation in Western Ontario, and that gentleman informed me that in the three or four years preceding, 9,000 subscribers on its weekly list had sent him other addresses in the United States. That is to say that they had left Canada and had gone to the United States. Heretofore they had been residents in Canada and their addresses had been in Canada, but after that date he was directed to send his paper to the United States. I made inquiries with respect to the movement of the population in several small towns, and I remember that in all these a very considerable number of persons were reported within the three or four preceding years to have gone to the United States. I recollect in one small town alone, in the constituency I then represented, a town not having a population of more than 1,200 or 1,-200; as many as 170 persons were reported to me, names given, to have removed to the United States within the three preceding years. I had another curious illustration of the extent of emigration from Ontario. For certain reasons of state, I was obliged to exercise a rather strict supervision over a certain election contest which took place in the earlier part of 1891 between one Alexander Gunn and one John Alexander Macdonald. The total vote polled on that occasion was a little over 3,000—and I need not tell you that every vote was polled that could be polled. Of that 3,000 we found that 400 voters in the city of Kingston had been brought from the United States at no inconsiderable expense to record their votes for Sir John Macdonald. Now, sir, these three circumstances alone would go very far to show—and they were merely three of many others I could have obtained evidence of—they will go far to show how extensive and widespread was the emigration from Ontario to the United States between the years 1881 and 1891.

I have also shown the extraordinary fraud which had been committed by the census enumerators of 1891 in the way of stuffing the census returns in the matter of industries to be credited to the national policy, and I want the House to understand distinctly that the instances I gave were only single instances out of many score. For days and for weeks in this House, as those who were then members will recollect, it was a constant practice to compel the finance minister of that day, much against his will, to answer certain questions with respect to the various industries which the enumerators had discovered throughout the Province of Ontario and elsewhere. I doubt if there was a single village in that province containing 500 or 600 people in which these ingenious persons did not discover at least 40 or 50 industrial establishments of various kinds. They are on record; there is no mistake about it; the Hansard is there to testify to this date to the remarkable ingenuity which these enumerators displayed. There was not a blacksmith, there was not an artisan, there was not a carpenter throughout the Province of Ontario, I verily believe, who was not put down as an industrial establishment whether the thing was run by himself or run by himself and his boy combined. I say that all these things together, coupled with the conduct of the government on which I lay very considerable stress in absolutely refusing their aid to an investigation when charges of gross fraud were preferred by members standing in their place in parliament—I say that all these things go to constitute a very strong prima facie case against the good faith of the enumerators of 1891. However, I admit there is room for argument, only I further call attention to the fact that at that particular moment the Conservative party was in a very deplorable plight, a kind of plight which would tempt and almost excuse strong party men—and we know very well that the census enumerators were strong party men—to do a good deal that they might otherwise have hesitated to do for the benefit of their party; and that it would have been in the highest degree for the benefit of their party to make the Ontario lists appear larger than they actually were, any man who remembers the condition of things in the spring of 1891 cannot presume to doubt. (Cheers.)

INVESTIGATION OF CENSUS FRAUDS IN ONTARIO

The emigration from Ontario is peculiar in some respects. It was not, as I understand the emigration from Quebec is or was, largely composed of individuals, generally young men or young women from particular families, and under the de jure system which prevailed then and which has prevailed since, there was a great opportunity given to any enumerators who chose to include people who had left Canada for many years, as I believe the enumerators did to a very great extent. Beyond all that—although the difficulties in our way are very great and although the expense at this distant time of ascertaining the facts are almost prohibitory—the Minister of Agriculture at my instance did cause in some cases investigation to be made. It will be for the House later on to say whether it is or it is not desirable that a commission should issue to inquire further into this matter. It is of quite sufficient importance I think to make it worthy of consideration, speaking for myself alone of course. The honorable Minister of Agriculture found that in the case of several towns, notably in the case of Goderich, notably in the case of Clinton, notably in the case of Simcoe, notably in the case of Cornwall, he found that there were a considerable number of instances in which evident frauds had been committed. As I say, the difficulties in his way are very great. The total number of these frauds which are discovered is probably insignificant compared with the number that were actually committed, but enough have been discovered—I think that the reports are in the hands of my honorable friend, and I have no doubt he will be only too ready to lay them on the table of the House—to show conclusively that there is good prima facie ground for saying that the census returns of 1891 for the Province of Ontario were grossly stuffed.

Mr. Sproule—Would the honorable gentleman tell us the newspaper he referred to and 9,000 of whose subscribers he said had gone to the United States?

The Minister of Trade and Commerce—I have no objection to state. It is the London Advertiser.

Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—It never had 9,000 subscribers.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce—On its weekly list? My honorable friend (Mr. Hughes) is very ignorant, I am sorry to say, of the extent to which the London Advertiser at that time circulated.

THE PAROCHIAL CENSUS OF QUEBEC.

No, sir, I come to another and a still more important phase of this question. As I have said, in Ontario, where I think the evidence is conclusive that there has been a grave miscount, the evidence as to the date at which that miscount took place is necessarily somewhat imperfect. I can only go on circumstantial evidence and on presumuption. But it so happens that in the sister Province of Quebec we stand on much firmer ground. Every honorable gentleman who knows anything of the customs of the people of Quebec is aware that in that province the parochial clergy every year make a very accurate census of all their parishioners, and I am informed of all people within their cure. From the nature of the case that census is much more strictly accurate where the population is chiefly Catholic and French than where it is mixed, but in any case it is a census the fairness of which no one on either side of the House will, I think, dispute. (Cheers.) I invite the special attention of the House to certain facts which I am about to lay before them with regard to the Province of Quebec. I have here a report carefully made by a chief officer of the census, Mr. Cote, in which that gentleman gives us the difference between the parochial census taken in 1891 and the government census of that year, and

THE RESULTS ARE VERY EXTRAORDINARY.

In the county of Bagot the government census discovered 2,743 more people than the parochial investigators had been able to find three months before. (Cheers.) In the county of Bellechasse it discovered 1,051 more people—(Hear, hear)—in Berthier, 3,432 more—(Hear, hear)—in Champlain, 2,230 more; in Dorchester, 608 more; in Iberville, 2,090 more; in Joliette, 3,817 more; in Kamouraska, 2,003 more; in l'Assomption, 1,223 more; in l'Islet, 1,008 more; in Lotbiniere, 1,191 more; in Maskinonge, 2,770 more; in Montmagny, 1,157 more; in Montmorency, 421 more; in Nicolet, 2,635 more; in Portneuf, 998 more; in Richelieu, 3,155 more; in Rimouski, 3,-783 more; in Rouville, 3,123 more; in Temiscouata, 1,134 more. (Cheers.) The above statement shows that the enumerators in 1891 raised in 21 counties 40,-615 more names than were recorded three months previous to the census by the parish priests. (Cheers. I am willing to admit that there will always be a slight disrepancy between such a census and the census taken by the government enumerators. I believe the parish priests do not enumerate those who are absent at the time, and there are some other slight differences; but our census of 1901 corresponds with these parochial censuses within 8,000 souls. (Cheers.) Therefore I say that these statements prima facie afford the clearest proof that can well be laid before the House of this distance of time that in these 21 counties of the Province of Quebec the lists were stuffed in 1891 to the extent of at least 32,000 souls. (Cheers.) Sir, that is by no means all. It is not to be supposed that this occurred in 21 districts only. There is evidence, and good evidence, as I think honorable gentlemen will have to admit, that not merely in these 21 counties, but in many others—I cannot say whether in all—of the 65 counties into which Quebec is divided, similar frauds were perpetrated. I have here a report of two subdivisions in the city of Montreal. That report shows that in these two subdivisions only the census was over-full by 1,006 persons. There were in the city of Montreal in 1891 125 enumerators for 125 subdistricts. I do not at all pretend to say that the fictitious entries in the others were in the least degree as large as they were in these; but if there were in two subdivisions of Montreal fictitious entries to the extent of 1,006, the House can judge for itself how likely it would be that other districts would escape scot-free. (Cheers.)

As this is a matter of more than trifling importance, I have obtained, by the kind permission of my friend the Minister of Agriculture, more ample returns regarding the Province of Quebec, which I shall proceed, for the information of the House, not to read—that would take too long a time—but to lay on the table. (Loud cheers.) Some of them, I observe, are in French, and it will be no doubt a pleasing task for some of the honorable gentlemen opposite of that persuasion—there are not many of them—to translate for the benefit of their English confreres. These are the returns for Bagot; these are the returns for Beauce; these for Berthier; these for Bonaventure; these for Bellechasse; these for Chateauguay; these for Champlain; these for Charlevoix; these for Chicoutimi; these for Dorchester; this for Gaspe. The honorable gentlemen will observe there is nothing to conceal. This for Jacques Cartier; this interesting one for Joliette; this for Kamouraska; this for l'Assomption; this for Labeile; Lapairie; Laval; Levis; Lothbiniere; Maskinonge; Montcalm; Montmorency; the city of Montreal; Nicolet; Portneuf; Richebucto; St. Jean D'Iberville; Temiscouata. (Cheers.)

I have here Mr. Cote's documents, which I lay on the table, being desirous to furnish every information to honorable gentlemen.

GRAVE MISCOUNT IN QUEBEC AND ONTARIO.

It is utterly impossible to compute the total extent of the frauds that were commited in Quebec, but I do not think anybody will say that I am exaggerating when, after examining the evidence that I have laid on the table, I say there is every reasonable ground for believing at least 50,000 or 60,-000 souls were improperly counted in Quebec in the census of 1891. In Ontario, as I have pointed out, I believe there was a grave miscount. I have given my reason for thinking that that miscount occurred in 1891, and it will be for the House to judge for themselves how far those reasons are entitled to credit. But I think this much is clear. There was a very large overcount in 1891, and strong probabilities—bearing in mind the evidence which the Minister of Militia produced with respect to the Maritime Provinces, and which was in no way contradicted—that at least from 125,-000 to 150,000 persons were wrongly counted in the Maritime Provinces in 1891, who consequently ought to be added to the census of 1901. Because it is tolerably plain to the meanest understanding that for every one improperly counted in 1891, we in 1901 are losing one. It does not very much matter to my main argument whether there was in Ontario an under-count in 1901 or an over-count in 1891. The main result would be the same, namely, that there has been a very much larger increase in the total population from 1890 to 1901 than the census returns in 1891 and 1901 taken together would appear to indicate. (Cheers.)

GROWTH IN THE LAST DECADE.

Now, I return to another not unimportant but comparatively insignificant matter. That is the question as to how far the increase which did take place in the last decade took place between 1891 and 1896, or 1896 and 1901. Here I must appeal to the commonsense of the House. From 1891 to 1896 everybody knows—and no men were lounder in declaring it than the predecessors of those honorable gentlemen—that Canada was laboring under a period of great depression, a period of deficits, of reduction of trade—just the sort of period during which many men would be sure to leave the country, and very few who came in would be likely to stay. That is a patent fact known to everybody. It is equally well known that from 1896 to 1901 Canada, as a whole, enjoyed a most unusual amount of prosperity. It is also well-known that there has been a very great reduction in the exodus which has taken place in Canada in the last four or five years. The evidence from the Province of Quebec and the evidence as to the settlement of the Northwest proves that beyond a doubt. And a piece of evidence which no doubt will commend itself strongly to honorable gentlemen opposite, goes very far to prove it also. I happen to have here

THE ASSESSORS' RETURN FOR TORONTO.

That is an interesting document. The assessors, as you know, take a yearly census in the good city of Toronto. Let me read to the House without inflicting on it the details, the result of the assessors' census in the city of Toronto, because it bears pretty strongly on the point which the Minister of Finance made, that there was a strong probability, to say the least, that the increase in the last five years of this decade was very much greater than in the first five years. The assessors census for 1891 gave 170,951 as the population of Toronto. In 1896 it gave that population as numbering 178,185, showing an increase in five years of just 7,000 souls. That same assessors' census in 1901 gave the population as 205,887, being an increase of 28,000 souls, in round numbers, as against 7,000 in 1896. (Loud cheers.) That may not be conclusive evidence for the Province of Ontario, but it is pretty clear evidence as to the movement of population in the good city of Toronto. I have been at pains to secure a list of the vacant buildings in Toronto during that period. In 1894 there were 4,633 buildings vacant. Let me read the list:

In 1894	4,633
In 1895	3,990
In 1896	4,014
In 1897	2,514
In 1898	2,672
In 1899	1,706
In 1900	761
In 1901	676

I submit, with all respect that this is tolerably clear evidence, quo ad Toronto at any rate, of the truth of the Finance Minister's assertion, that population increased a great deal more rapidly in our regime from 1896 to 1901 than it did from 1881 to 1896. (Cheers.)

GAINS OF THE LAST FIVE YEARS.

Now, if honorable gentlemen opposite admit—I do not ask them to admit, but if they are disposed, as my friends on this side are disposed, to admit—that I have made out a frima facie case for believing that there was an over count of 125,000 or 150,000 in the census of 1891, what follows? Why, this follows, that in the ten years ending with 1891, the increased population was just about 350,000. And this further follows that, in the ten years from 1891 to 1901, the increase of population was just 700,000. And if I am correct in my opinion that, after 1896 the exodus was materially checked—I do not say abolished altogether—and if I am correct in the future statement which I make, and for which I will give some further evidence presently, that from 1896 to 1897, the great bulk of the immigrants who came to this country remained in this country—then, sir, I say it is not very unlikely, on the contrary, there is the strongest ground for believing, that, after 1896, Canada gained at the rate of 100,000 a year. (Cheers.) After all, that would be a very small matter. It would merely mean that we reduced the exodus from 50,000 to 25,000, and added 25,000 by immigration to our population. And, if that be so, if we added for five years—and all the evidence points that way—100,000 a year to our population, and if you admit my previous calculation as to the over-count in 1891, then, everything I stated is proven to the letter, and the growth the last five years is shown to be fully equal to the growth of the preceding fifteen years. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)

GROWING VOLUME OF IMIGRATION.

This matter of the growing immigration of Canada is one that has attracted a good deal of attention. It was my painful duty some years ago, standing in the place at present occupied by the leader of the Opposition, to call the attention of the House and the country to the very remarkable fact that, whereas our immigration returns as published by the late Government showed an immigration to Canada in the ten years from 1881 to 1891 of 886,000 persons, the census returns, making every allowance for the loss by death of the foreign-born population, only showed 150,000. Of 886,000 only 150,000 remained in Canada. As I have said, it is interesting to trace the movement of population in the Northwest upon which so much depends. I have here an enumeration furnished me by the Department of Agriculture, for the number of immigrants that came to Canada from 1897 to 1900. I find that the total number of immigrants who came in 1897 was 20,016; in 1898 the number had risen to 30,742; in 1899 these immigrants numbered 44,506; in 1900 they mustered 44,-697; and for the fiscal year 1900-1, they mustered 49,149—although I apprehend that in these two years there was some overlapping. At any rate the total in these five years would amount to 164,-000. I find further, that, in 1897, 712 immigrants from the United States reported themselves in Canada; in 1898 the number of these Americans coring was 9,119, in 1899 the number was 11,945; in 1900 there was 15,500; and, in the fiscal year 1900-1 there were 17,987. (Cheers.) If these remained here, there is not much need to add further evidence to show the very strong probability, to say the least of it, that our population has increased 500,000 in the last five years. What is the ground for holding that probably at least the greater number of people remained here? I have here a very interesting statement showing the number of acres sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Hudson's Bay Company and other railways and other landowners in Manitoba and the Northwest. I invite the attention of the House to these records. I drop the odd figures. In 1893 these companies sold 120,000 acres; in 1894, they sold 68,000 acres; in 1835, 114,000 acres; and in 1896, 108,000 acres. This was a total of 411,000. In 1898, these same companies in one year sold 448,000 acres—(loud cheers)—a good deal more in that one year than had been sold in the four years that I have just enumerated. In 1899, they sold 162,000 acres; in 1900, they sold 648,000 acres; and in 1901, they sold 621,000 acres. (Renewed cheers.) Thus, in the four years from 1835 to 1896, both inclusive, these companies sold to settlers 411,000 acres, and in the four years from 1898 to 1901, both inclusive, they sold 2,180,000 acres. (Cheers.) I think that is tolerably good presumptive of evidence that the great bulk of immigrants that came to Canada under our regime remained here. This is further confirmed by the information we have been able to obtain from our various agents scattered throughout the Northwest Territories. But there is another little evidence in the same direction. I have here a statement showing the homesteads in these periods, leaving out the canceled homesteads, the number was as follows:

1893	2,493
1894	1,926
1895	1,419
1896	1,384
Total for four years	7,222
1898	3,876
1899	5,504
1900	7,012
1901	8,136
Total for four years	24,588

Now, that may not be direct evidence, but I submit that it is very strong circumstantial evidence in proof of the very important statement that we have been increasing our population in vastly greater ratio during the last five years than we did during the first five years of this decade. (Loud cheers.)

Sir, it appears to me that in all that there is good promise for the future. And it appears to me there is good promise on this one condition, that we steer clear of former errors and that Canada in the future does not, as she did in the past, go philandering—the Vulgate has a stronger word—go philandering after new inventions. (A laugh.) Sir, our losses have been tremendous, our progress also may be tremendous if we only will condescend to learn where our real strength is, and where the future of Canada properly lies.

GRAVITY OF THE EXODUS.

I would like to say a good deal on two or three other points of interest connected with this census. I would like to say something about the distribution of our rural and urban population. I might have a word or two to say on the delicate question of the education that we are giving to our people. But I pause. I must pass over those subjects, because I have to deal with another and also very interesting portion of this subject, and that is the question of the causes of this exodus. I have pointed out how grave the exodus was; I have shown you that in all human probability, of our own flesh and blood we have lost about a million and a half within twenty years. And mind you, that statement, formidable as it is, is amply corroborated by the experiences of other countries in similar condition to our own. Now, sir, a question of the gravest moment, one which is the very reverse of an academic question, is whether that was due to causes which were beyond our control, or whether that enormous exodus was due to preventible causes. If due to causes beyond our control, there is nothing more to be said; if due to causes which can or should have been prevented, it demands our utmost strength and energy to prevent this fatal drain on our resources from continuing.

I say again that the exhibit in the matter of population from 1881 to 1891 is a most miserable exhibition. Take Manitoba, rural and urban, and we find the rural population of Manitoba in those 20 years increased by 24,000 families. We look across the border, and we see that the State of Dakota alone, North and South together, increased its rural population by 120,000 families, while Manitoba was adding 24,000 to hers. We look at Minnesota, and we find that Minnesota gained 200,000 families in the same period. We find that 320,000 families were added to Dakota and to Minnesota in the 20 years from 1881 to 1901, while Manitoba and the Northwest together hardly gained 35,-000 or 40,000 families, Manitoba certainly not more than 24,000. Those 320,000 families were productive in the highest degree. They have added most enormously to the wealth and prosperity of the United States. Dakota and Minnesota have alone added hundreds of millions a year to the annual products of the United States. With good government and good management the huge territories that we possess, Manitoba, Alberta, Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, should have added in that interval equally to our resources and our trade.

Now, sir, that statement alone is enough to condemn us, but there is much more behind. I charge over and above downright neglect, simple neglect and misuse of those superb opportunities,

CRIMINAL MALADMINISTRATION

on the part of the Government of the day. On this subject I speak with knowledge. For many years, from 1880 to 1886, I was in the habit of making yearly visits to the Province of Manitoba. I have traversed the greater part of it again and again, not by railroad, but in company with men like my friend, the Hon. Thomas Greenway, and others of the same standing, who were very intimately acquainted with the possibilities of the Province of Manitoba. I witnessed the most extraordinary rush of settlers which went into Manitoba in the years 1879, 1880, 1881 and 1882. I never in all my life saw men more admirably qualified to develop a young country than were the settlers who were pouring in by tens of thousands from the best counties of Ontario, and other portions of this Dominion, to which I have already alluded. There were men and there was money in abundance, and nothing on earth but the most frightful blunders on the part of the Government of the day prevented those men from developing Manitoba just as Dakota and Minnesota have been developed. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Sir, I say that it was owing to the intolerable railway policy of the Government, that it was owing to the intolerable blunders of their land policy, that it was owing in large measure to their fiscal policy, that we see today in Manitoba and the Northwest, miserable, that is, compared with what it might have been, compared with what is the case on the other side of the border. Sir, I stood myself in the railway committee room upstairs, and I heard the Government of Canada deliberately refuse the settlers of Manitoba and the Northwest the right to build a railroad at their own expense, without costing the Government of Canada one penny. (Cheers.) What should I say of the introduction of that mischievous and ill-considered measure, the checker-board system? Who that has been in Manitoba, who of all of us who knows that country, does not know that its great want is to have the population brought together, that the great difficulty is that the settlers are isolated? Schools and churches are almost impossible when men are separated for a great distance. What did the Government do? They deliberately introduced a system by which every man was kept at a distance of a mile or a mile and a half from his neighbor. The result was that settlement was slack, that people did not choose to go into the country and take up land when they were refused the right to build railroads at their own expense, and compelled to set themselves down at a distance of half a league or more from their nearest neighbor. I recollect at the time there were a number of Yankee capitalists, perfectly well acquainted with what had been going on in Dakota and Minnesota, who would have been only too happy to furnish the money for the purpose of constructing these railroads. But they were refused admittance, they were driven out, literally, they were pitchforked out, and what were the results? Why, we lost the whole of these magnificent seed years, as I may call them, from 1878 to 1885. I am within the mark when I say that 20,000 settlers in Southern Manitoba alone were expelled from Manitoba and obliged to take refuge in Dakota and Minnesota by reason of the fiscal policy of the Government of the day. Nor was there any relief found for that state of things until there had been one rebellion on the Saskatchewan, and until the people of Maintoba had virtually risen in rebellion also. No wonder that I spoke strongly in my place in the House as to the way in which the future of the Northwest was being sacrificed by these men. Had they simply let the matter alone, had they simply allowed the people of Ontario and the other provinces to go in, had they simply allowed them to build railways, simply allowed them to make the best of the opportunities before them—I say, and I speak with knowledge—that by 1885 there would have been 50,000 families of magnificent settlers settled in Manitoba, and that today in Manitoba and in the valleys of the Saskatchewan, in the districts of Alberta and Assiniboia, you would have had a population, not perhaps as large as that of Dakota and Minnesota, but a population in all human probability of 250,000 families, or a million and a quarter strong. (Cheers.)

WHAT THE RESULTS MIGHT HAVE BEEN.

Now, think for a moment what that would have meant to Canada. Winnipeg today would have been a worthy rival to St. Paul and Minneapolis. Our provinces, and they are equally fertile, quite as good as the states that I have mentioned, would never have feared to enter into competition with Dakota and Minnesota. Sir Charles Tupper's vision of 600,000,000 bushels there might very well have been realized—(cheers and laughter)—it never could have been under his management—but it might have been if Manitoba had been left to the management of the late Mr. Mackenzie. But there was a more excellent way, and that was pointed out to my certain knowledge. The huge amount of money that was wasted in Manitoba in land booms might have been used to the advantage of that province. It was pointed out in this House that had

THE POLICY OF MR. MACKENZIE

been adopted we would have seen today in all human probability, not a million and a quarter, but two millions of people settled in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. (Cheers.) In making that statement I claim no more for us than was done on the other side of the border under greater difficulties. If the policy of Alexander Mackenzie had prevailed in 1878 that would have been the result. Now the time has come when I gladly embrace the opportunity to do this scant justice to the memory of my old colleague. He has passed away, not unhonored. At the time of his death I think Mr. Mackenzie's worth was recognized by all classes of the community, but he passed away hardly appreciated. It was the fashion among some of his own supporters to say that Alexander Mackenzie was all honesty and no policy, while Sir John Macdonald was all policy—I shall not finish the sentence. (Laughter and cheers.) Alexander Mackenzie had his faults like the rest of us. He had his faults, but he was honest and sagacious. What was his policy? His policy was, like himself, simple, straightforward, and sensible. He intended—the thing had been shaping in his mind for some time, he developed it partly on the floor of this House, he developed it to a greater extent in speeches which he made in my presence in the Maritime Provinces and in parts of Ontario towards the end of the campaign of 1878, his policy had three grand features—he intended, in the first place, to reserve the land for settlers, to sell it to settlers only at low rates, and to give money only to promote the building of colonization railways, he intended, in the second place, to construct a number of short line colonization railways radiating from Winnipeg, and he intended in the third place to use all the power of the Government to keep the people together and form a solid state in and about the present Province of Manitoba, from which, afterwards, as a base, railways might radiate on every side. (Loud cheers.) I have several times since discussed that policy with men of great ability and men of experience in the Northwest Territories, men of all political persuasions, and they have agreed with me that it was one of the greatest misfortunes that ever befell the Northwest Territories that it had not been carried out.

Mr. Sproule—Especially the water stretches.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce—And Alexander Mackenzie intended to keep control of the railways and railway rates. (Cheers.) In respect to the water stretches Mr. Mackenzie wisely used them to the utmost of his power, and perhaps the honorable gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has forgotten that at the time he went out he was most busily engaged in pressing forward the construction of the railway from Winnipeg to Fort William. I say that if Mr. Mackenzie's policy had been adopted, and I say it with the knowledge which comes after forty years' experience in public affairs, and with the knowledge of a man that has traveled Manitoba from end to end, not once, but a dozen times over, if Mr. Mackenzie's policy had been adopted in all human probability you would have had 500,000 families, or 2,000,000 people settled in Manitoba, Alberta, Assiniboia, and Saskatchewan, and a volume of trade and commerce not far from $1,-000,000,000 a year. Let honorable gentlemen sit down and calculate what would be the result of a development such as I have spoken of. I will not say a development of two millions, but suppose we had a million, or a million and a quarter of people settled in that country, what a large boon that would have been to the whole of Canada! All that was within our grasp, and all that we could have had by letting the people alone. We could have that by adopting the policy of Mr. Mackenzie. Honorable gentlemen have a good deal to learn from this census, we have a good deal to learn from it, the people of Canada have a good deal to learn from it, and one lesson I would like the people of Canada to lay to heart is the lesson of what Canada lost in 1878 by discarding Mr. Mackenzie. Had Canada allowed Mr. Mackenzie to remain in power and to carry out the scheme he was then devising for the development of the Northwest Territories, I am quite sure today that the people of Canada would have been