

Mr. MONTAGUE. But you did not go ahead in those very things from 1874 to 1878.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The trade policy surely could not control the harvest or determine whether it would be good or bad, and as for imports, I shall show that any decrease was only in the values and not in the quantities. I shall prove that, beyond the shadow of a doubt, by a statistical table which I shall read directly. Judging by the one great factor which determines the prosperity and advancement of a country, there is not that prosperity to-day in Canada that hon. gentlemen opposite, in their hearts, would like to see. Take the population of this country, and what are the facts? Leaving out the question of immigration altogether, and you have a loss in this new country of Canada—a country for which we all, I care not what be our political proclivities, hope better things—of 400,000 people in ten years. Adding to that the 800,000 immigrants no longer in the country, and you have a loss in ten years of 1,200,000 people. How will you get over these facts? Are you going to avoid them by hiding your heads, ostrich-like, in the sand? If you are honest men, you have to look the facts in the face and see if there is anything in the existing system which has given rise to this awful exodus from this new country. Take the maritime provinces, with which I am more familiar. Those of you who know the natural resources of that country, know that they are unequalled in any part of the world. Take Nova Scotia, whose shores are washed with waters teeming with fish, and whose mineral resources cannot be excelled even by the far-famed Kootenay valley of British Columbia; take New Brunswick with its great forest wealth, and Prince Edward Island with its agricultural resources; and tell me why these provinces, peopled as they are by those sprung from the best stock in the world, have retrograded in the past ten years in their population. It is one of the most damning facts ever brought against any policy carried out by any Government. Between 1871 and 1881, our progress was not what it ought to be, but we increased, at any rate, 110,000 people in population during that decade. What have you done to-day? You have introduced your policy of restricting trade and taxing trade and taxing the people in order to build up factories, and you have driven out from these three provinces no less than 165,000 people in the ten years. We all remember the fluent tongue of the Finance Minister, as some years ago, he dwelt with much unction on the natural flow of the people from the rural districts to the cities. I challenge him upon his own ground. Take the cities in the maritime provinces, with populations of over

5,000—St. John, Halifax, Charlottetown, Moncton, Fredericton, Yarmouth and Truro; take their population in 1881 and compare it with the population of 1891, and what have you got? The paltry, pitiable increase of 7,000 in the aggregate. Why, the natural increase in the people should have been 13,000 odd in those cities alone. We have lost, therefore, in ten years, not from the rural districts because many of these have been partially decimated—but in the cities alone of over 5,000 people, where, if anywhere, the policy of the Government ought to show some proof, we have lost not less than 7,000 people, and a total of 165,000 in all the maritime provinces. I say that the factor of population is the one which determines, above all other, the prosperity and advancement of a people. Show me a city or county whose population has doubled or increased 30 or 40 per cent in ten years, and I will show you a county or city where the elements of prosperity exist, where real estate has increased in value, and where the people are thriving, happy and prosperous.

Then, hon. gentlemen opposite tell us, among other things, that if they have not kept the population at home they certainly have given employment to the few who did remain at home. Is that true? I say it is not. Before the census returns came down the hon. gentleman could generalize, but now we are able to bring them face to face with their own official figures which they cannot deny. But what do we find? We find that out of 1,659,000 people engaged in different occupations in Canada, nearly one-half, or 790,000 are employed in agriculture, fishing, lumbering or mining, while only 320,000 are engaged in mechanical pursuits. When you come to analyse the pursuits in which these 320,000 are engaged, how many are found to be engaged in pursuits which are assisted in any sense or way by the National Policy? Why, Sir, it will not be contended that the ordinary carpenters and joiners, or dress-makers, or blacksmiths, or painters, or machinists, or those engaged in other similar trades are in any way influenced or improved by the National Policy.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Certainly they are.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman interrupts me, without there being any point in his interruption, for a mere assertion such as he makes proves nothing. The hon. gentleman will see that these classes to which I have referred number 255,000 out of 320,000. I have analysed and gone over the census to see how many there are who are directly affected by the National Policy. I find them to be of the following classes: Cotton mill operatives, woollen mill