

place; it was true that a large emigration was taking place to-day. In the very nature of things a considerable emigration would be always going on. The people of Canada were a migratory people to a considerable extent. The same thing was true of the people of the United States. The State of New York, with a population about equal to that of Canada, had lost up to 1871, according to the United States census, over one million of its native population who had gone to the western States of the Union, passing from one part of the country to the other, and the same process would go on here. If hon. members would take the case of the county of Bruce, which, if he remembered aright, was surveyed in 1853, they would find, if they asked the people of that county where they came from, that, to a large extent, they came from the older counties of Ontario. A few of them—of course a considerable number of them were persons who had come to work upon the Great western or the Grand Trunk, and when those roads were completed, went into the newer counties of the Province, of which Bruce was one, where they took up land and became industrious and well-to-do settlers. But that sort of settlement had to come to an end, because these newer counties had become settled, and there being no more of them the people naturally drifted towards the North-Western States. But now we had our own North-West, where, we hoped, with the railway facilities which were likely to be afforded to that country, our people would go in the future. There was no doubt, however, that there had been that sort of migration. But the position which had been taken by the Conservative party in Opposition was that largely in consequence of the want of a policy which would give employment to our own people, they were leaving this country for the United States. That idea might have been right or it might have been wrong; he was not going to discuss the National Policy on this motion. He thought the discussion on that point had been irrelevant to a large extent. That policy may have been wise or it might have been unwise; it may have resulted beneficially or otherwise, but at all events it was a policy advocated as a means of remedying an evil which had been pointed out. Did hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to recommend any such policy? He supposed they would say: "Go back to free trade." That was a suggestion which two or three times he had heard to-day. That must mean *pro tanto*, at any rate the injury of the manufacturing interests and the losing of labor in the different centres of population. Let them take Montreal for instance. That policy would close the large sugar refineries there. He did not say for the purpose of this argument that they should or should not be closed, but at any rate the closing of those refineries would throw out of employment some 400 heads of families, and that means a population of nearly 2,000 persons who must go somewhere else for employment, and who would probably go to the refineries of the United States. The Conservative party said there was a serious emigration from this country which would be largely prevented by a policy which would give employment to the people of Canada within their own country. That was the ground upon which—

Mr. KILLAM. You should not discuss the National Policy.

Mr. WHITE said he was not discussing the National Policy, he was simply showing what was the position of the Conservative party on this question. What he said was that they quoted these statements in relation to emigration with a suggestion of a remedy to prevent it, while hon. gentlemen opposite were doing nothing of the kind. More than that they had taken statistics compiled by American authorities, over whom we had no control, which, in the very nature of things, could not be true, because people could not be carried over at that particular point and within the time given to the numbers mentioned by those

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

hon. gentlemen. The object of this motion was simply to find out whether we had any information in relation to that emigration. He entirely agreed with the hon. member for West Middlesex, that it was the duty of the Government to enquire into this matter. He had reason to believe that the Government did enquire into it, and the object of the motion was to get the result of those enquiries on the Table. When they were brought down the proper course would be to refer them to the Committee on Colonization and Immigration, where they could be analyzed and sifted by those hon. gentlemen of the Opposition who were members of the Committee. There would always be an emigration westward, both to our own territory and to the American States, but he was satisfied that when this information was brought down it would show that emigration had not been at all equal to what the hon. gentlemen opposite had stated it was.

Mr. BLAKE said the hon. gentleman for Cardwell said that when his hon. friends made allegations in Opposition as to the amount of emigration from this country, they did so justifiably, because they suggested the adoption of a policy to prevent the continuance of that state of things. The hon. gentleman had stated that the Opposition were not justified in making statements as to emigration because they did not propose the same remedy.

Mr. WHITE said he had not stated that they had not proposed the same policy, but that they had not proposed any remedy.

Mr. BLAKE said they proposed to revert to a set of things which would diminish the emigration from the greatly increased figures which resulted from the change of policy adopted by the hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman had said that he had succeeded in achieving a change in the policy which he pledged himself would reduce emigration. Well, they contended that it had not reduced emigration—that whatever other merits might be attributable to the policy, that particular merit was not attributable to it. The hon. gentleman said that there could not have been so great an emigration since the adoption of this policy, but they maintained that it had had a contrary effect to the one predicted by the hon. gentleman and his friends. The question was one of the utmost interest to this country. It was of the utmost interest that we should know what were the facts—not merely to-day, not merely for the last year, but for a great number of years—with reference to the emigration from this country. The hon. gentleman opposite stated that his friends indulged only in general statements, but he (Mr. Blake) maintained that whenever allusion had been made to this subject in the past, that allusion had been based upon just the same results upon which the allusions made on this side of the House, within the past year, had been based. The hon. member for Cardwell, in former debates, referred to the number of native Canadians settled in the United States. Where did he get his figures?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I got them not from the Customs' office returns, but from the census.

Mr. BLAKE said the hon. member got them from United States statistics, the only place where he could get them, and where any figures obtained at any time with reference to the emigration from Canada to the United States had to be obtained. He was not aware that any attempt had yet been made to publish a record of that emigration in this country. Yet figures had been indulged in from year to year, and results had been ascertained. To what figures had hon. gentlemen appealed during this long series of years? Why, they appealed to the American statistics appearing yearly, and he maintained that the result as a whole would be discredited if it turned out that there had been gross, wilful, manifest error at any one point. What the hon. gentleman