

his counter, waiting in vain for customers that did not come—that could not come—because they had no money and no employment; and therefore ruin and bankruptcy fell upon the merchant, and the official assignee walked the land like a pestilence at noonday. Sir, I start from one point—idleness of the people, want of employment, no factories in operation, and consequently no customers for the merchant—and there follow a bankrupt merchant and an empty treasury. I start from the other point—employment for the people, money for the people, money taken by the people to the merchant, the merchant busy, and a full treasury. You start from one point, and you reach the one conclusion absolutely; you start from the other point, and you reach the other conclusion just as certainly. When you have employment for the people, you have not only a busy merchant and a full treasury, but you have above all a contented and happy people. Daniel Webster, the great American statesman, speaking upon this point, after he had been converted to protective views, said:—

"The interests of every laboring community require diversity of occupation, pursuits and objects of industry. The more that diversity is multiplied or extended, the better. To diversify employment is to enhance wages. And, sir, take this great truth, place it on the title page of every book of political economy intended for use, put it on every farmer's almanac; let it be the heading of every column in every mechanic's magazine. Proclaim it everywhere and make it a proverb, that where there is work for the hands of men there will be work for their teeth. Where there is employment there will be bread. It is a great blessing to the poor to have cheap food; but greater than that, prior to that, and of still higher value, is the blessing of being able to buy food by honest and respectable employment. Employment feeds, clothes and instructs; employment gives strength, sobriety and morals. Constant employment and well paid labor produce, in a country like ours, general prosperity, content and cheerfulness. Thus happy have we seen the country, thus happy may we long continue to see it."

The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), some time during this session, told us that the National Policy had been a failure, because there had been large importations in excess of the exports; and he gave figures by which he made it appear that there had been an excess of \$101,762,000 worth of imports over exports. Now, sir, let me refer to this for a moment. We were in very peculiar circumstances. Manitoba, the Northwest and British Columbia imported largely of foreign goods, having no facilities for procuring goods of domestic manufacture. If the hon. gentleman will compare the imports into Manitoba, the Northwest and British Columbia from 1874 to 1879 with the imports from 1880 to 1885, he will find that they imported in the latter period \$45,603,000 worth of foreign goods. If he will take that from our excess of imports over exports for the same period,

he will find that it leaves but \$56,159,000, or \$9,359,833 a year. He will also find that the imports into those districts from 1874 to 1879 were only \$18,000,000, which deducted from the excess of imports over exports, will leave \$86,000,000; or in that period there was an excess of imports over exports, exclusive of Manitoba, the Northwest and British Columbia of \$17,242,000 a year, while from 1880 to 1885 there was only an excess of \$9,359,000 a year. But the hon. gentleman will also find, on examination of the trade and revenue returns, that a large proportion of the excess of imports over exports in the older provinces was raw material for manufacture, or articles that should come in free. For instance, there was an increase in 1885 over 1878 in hides and horns of \$563,000, in cotton and wool of \$1,500,000, in settlers' effects of \$746,000, in coin and bullion of \$2,250,000, and so on, making an excess of imports over exports in those articles, which are free, of \$8,630,000; so that the whole excess of imports over exports in the older provinces is disposed of in that way. Mr. Speaker, I have detained the house at greater length than I intended, or should have done, and I must apologize for it. But an hon. gentleman opposite has said that we have driven more than \$40,000 people out of the country, and I suppose we shall hear the same thing from the hon. gentleman who is about to address the house on the opposite side. It is true, sir, we have not had in the past that great increase of numbers that they have had in the United States. In the United States, long previous to the taking of the last census, they had a policy of protection to home industry. They had a policy of giving their people employment and high wages, a policy which drew immigrants to the United States from all parts of the world. They had also opened for settlement large tracts of prairie country, and the two policies combined helped to increase the population of the United States at a greater rate than the increase in the Dominion. But, Sir, if we take the American census of 1880 and the Canadian census of 1881, and if we select a number of the older States, which offer a fair ground for comparison with the Dominion of Canada, we will find we have held our own very well. Of course, if you go into the newer States, with attractions of new territory and prairie soil, you will find a much larger percentage of increase; but what I want is to make a comparison with the older States. Connecticut, which had 537,000 inhabitants in 1871, had 622,683 in 1881. Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Dakota—I put in Dakota as a set-off to Manitoba—comparing those states with Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba and British