

that time when we had no open North-west lands to which our people could be directed that the stream of population from this country seeking wider agricultural areas set towards the wider lands of the United States of America—set there in the increasing ratio I have spoken of, the stream constantly growing larger. The United States had some offset to this; we had comparatively little for another reason why people go from country districts into cities and towns is that they intend to engage in industrial pursuits and they go where the industries are. In the earlier periods that I have spoken of, the United States had this advantage for keeping a certain part of their population in the country. They had their large manufacturing works in great and abundant development ten or twenty years ago, and a large proportion of the people who were on the move from the country places were directed towards those industrial centres. They were not lost to that portion of the country, but engaged in a different kind of life. In Canada we did not have that advantage. The number of industrial institutions we had was small, their scope was not extended, and people who wished to change their mode of life from farming to industrial pursuits were directed to the great centres of industry in the eastern states; and every one who has studied the figures of population knows that the larger exodus from this country has been that of persons who went from our eastern provinces to the manufacturing towns of the eastern states. Well, Sir, I wish to put this point, and to put it strongly, that if we in Canada had had our great west opened up twenty years ago, and if we had had that industrial and manufacturing interest and power and scope twenty years ago that we have to-day, this exodus from our country would not have commenced, and we would not be in the position we are in to-day. Well, Sir, what did hon. gentlemen opposite do towards stopping the exodus during the years they were in power? Was theirs a wide, a bold, a strong policy of opening up the North-west and making those fertile lands capable of being used by our people? Sir, they trembled and stood still during the whole time that they had the administration of the affairs of this country, and at the end of it they had not even commenced to open up the fertile lands of the North-west to the streams of population who were looking for land, and who, actuated by that hunger, went in ever-increasing numbers to the great land areas of the United States of America. Sir, what did they do in planting industrial operations, manufactures and centres of industry in this country, or encouraging them, whereby that proportion of the population which makes a change from the rural districts to the cities, from agricultural to industrial life, would be kept in this country? Nothing. They allowed the manufactories of

Mr. FOSTER.

the United States, in their own words, to slaughter our manufactures in this country and thus ruin our industries; and they encouraged consequently the people of Canada to go over in ever-increasing numbers to work in the mills of that country. They never took one step, by public policy or governmental action, towards promoting the establishment of any industries in this country, where our people could obtain work and thus be kept at home to add to our wealth and progress. Neither in the shape of opening up our North-west and its broad lands, nor in encouraging manufacturers, did these gentlemen ever take a single step, and by their inaction and lack of vigorous policy they made the stream strong and broad which was taking our people continually over to the broad lands and the industrial centres of the United States. Yet these men now come to us, who have been in power and who have had a policy of development for ten or twelve years, and complain that we have not entirely stopped the exodus. Sir, a great stream is much more easily started and sent on its course than stayed once it has gained volume, breadth and force. These are some of the obvious reasons why Canada has been at a disadvantage. Will the strongest partisan on the other side of the House, and I hope there are not many partisans sitting there, contradict me when I say that it was in spite of the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite that we opened up the great North-west? Yes, Mr. Speaker, I say in spite of their efforts. Every step that the Liberal-Conservative Government took, from the time Sir Charles Tupper brought in his resolution in 1880 to open up that great North-west by building its only channel of communication, the Canadian Pacific Railway, was opposed. Every step we took was fought in the House and in the country and ridiculed at every opportunity; and these gentlemen, after having failed to scotch that enterprise at its beginning, when, at a certain time, the fate of that road and the fate of Canada hung in the balance, and when the road was saved and our country was saved by the grant of additional aid, these men opposed that grant, and, if they had had the power, they would not have hesitated to destroy the Canadian Pacific Railway and inflict immeasurable disaster upon our country. These gentlemen now taunt us because there has been an exodus from this country to the United States. Sir, in this matter of population are we so badly off as these gentlemen state? Or if it be true that all truth is in part comparative, has my hon. friend done his duty as a thinker, has he done his duty as a statesman or as an honest man and a politician, in giving to this Parliament only one side of the case and steadily avoiding the other? Are there not other countries in which the population has been partly stationary or has declined? We have had one gain to-night. We have had now from the front rank a certain declaration which my