

markets for the prices of their produce, the high prices were not the result of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman said he had met Liberals in his county who told him they could not understand how the Liberal party could be dissatisfied with the results of the National Policy. If that hon. gentleman was to call a meeting in his county he could not get a majority of his constituents to pass a resolution endorsing the National Policy. The hon. gentleman referred to elections in the Province of Quebec within the last couple of years, as a proof that the people were satisfied with the National Policy. But he might have referred to the election which took place in his own constituency a year ago, in which the Liberal candidate was elected by over 250 majority, notwithstanding the great efforts and influence of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. HOUDE. That was for another Parliament.

Mr. BÉCHARD. The struggle was made on the same ground, in a great measure, as that which took place in Ontario, that is to say, on the ground of Federal politics. He (Mr. Béchard) did not attribute this great exodus to the application of the National Policy, but he would say the National Policy had failed to prevent it, as was promised two years ago and during the last elections.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) said hon. gentlemen opposite made a great mistake in attempting to discredit the statements made by hon. gentlemen on this side, in regard to the great exodus from the Dominion since a year or two. These statements were either true or untrue. To sustain the position that they were untrue we had simply the general statements of hon. gentlemen opposite; we had the reckless calculation of the hon. Minister of Agriculture who attempted to arrive at the extent of the emigration from Canada by deducting the number of passengers crossing the frontier into the United States from those returning. What had we to sustain the contention that the exodus does exist? We had, in the first place, very carefully prepared statistics from the United States, statistics prepared by Custom-house officers, who were, no doubt, quite able to discharge the duties of their office; we had statements which embraced not simply the general report of emigrants or of people passing from one country to another, but that gave details such as their last place of residence, their occupation, destination, &c. Statements prepared in this way with such care, which were made, not merely at the frontier ports of entry, but at all the Atlantic and Pacific ports of entry, which were sent to Washington, authenticated by the signatures of these Custom-house officers, were more to be depended on than the general statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. These very statements had been quoted by hon. gentlemen opposite, during the regime of the late Administration, as a proof that the country was languishing, that the people were not prospering, that our trade was declining; and if hon. gentlemen made use of these statements fairly, as proving the existence of that state of things under the late Government, it did not lie in their mouths to refuse at least to pay respectful deference to similar statistics quoted on the opposite side of the House. This was a very serious question, the weight of the evidence, so far as he had been able to consider it, went to show that there was an alarming exodus. He believed that the facts quoted by hon. gentlemen on this side were sustained by similar asseverations in their own localities. He was not prepared to say what was the extent of this emigration from his own district, but he did say that he had no reason to believe that the population in the western part of Ontario was increasing very rapidly. He could go further and give many instances in which prosperous and well-to-do farmers had sold out and gone to the North-West. But there was more than that involved in the statement. It was a serious thing in a country like ours, with only a limited population, to be told that something like 100,000 people had left us during the last year. What did that represent? They

Mr. BÉCHARD.

learned from the reports of the Minister of Agriculture, that every emigrant to Canada represented a cost of about \$50, so that the loss of 100,000 people to the Dominion represented an annual loss to the wealth of the country of \$5,000,000 which was an alarming amount considered from that point of view. More than that, they would notice that every individual member of our population represented to the revenue of this country at least \$6 per head per annum; so that the loss of 100,000 people annually meant a loss to the revenue of \$60,000 a year. What he would have expected the Minister of Agriculture to have done, when these serious statements were made by hon. gentlemen on this side, would have been to make a careful investigation of the matter, so that he would have been able to place before the House reliable and satisfactory evidence that the exodus did not exist. The effect of this exodus upon those people who feel disposed to settle in our country must be injurious. Hon. gentlemen opposite must not blame members on this side if they called attention to the facts. The Government and its supporters were quite ready to call attention to the expatriation of thousands of Canadians as they called it, under the late Administration, and they said they were doing their duty as an Opposition in so stating their views with regard to the matter. Were hon. gentleman on this side doing less when they warned the Government that the expatriation was going on still, and at a very rapid rate? If the statistics of the United States Customs officers were correct they had the astounding fact that while, during the five years of the late Administration, 120,937 people left the Dominion for the United States, during the two years of the present Government, 130,602 had left the Dominion, or a greater number by 10,000 in two years, than during five years of the late Administration. Now, if this statement were true—and it was well authenticated—it required the earnest consideration of the Government—it required more than to be pooh-poohed by hon. gentlemen opposite. When the report went already to the Old Country that Canada was a country not to be desired, that it was a country from which our own people were fleeing, and fleeing rapidly, month by month and year by year, everybody knew what the effect would be, that we would receive less than our share of the immigration from Europe. Hon. gentlemen opposite said that members on this side should extol their country. It was not involved in this discussion whether they should extol or decry their country. They were dealing with a particular question, and the question was whether there was or was not such a large emigration as that to which attention had been called in the House. It was not a matter of importance at the present moment whether the exodus was due to the National Policy or to some other cause. The great question was did the exodus exist? And the answer to that question should be established by reliable evidence. He had here a statement from a newspaper published in Manitoba in the interests of the Government, in reference to one single party of emigrants that left in charge of Mr. Taylor of Ottawa. It was as follows:—

"Four hundred and ten Canadians left Ontario on Wednesday, October 8th, in charge of Mr. Taylor the Ottawa immigration agent, and, of these, only about one hundred and fifty came to this Province. The remainder two hundred and sixty were distributed at various points of the United States, but principally in Dakota. The proportion, as nearly as may be, was one third to Manitoba and two-thirds to the United States. * * * The start was made from Ottawa on Wednesday, the 8th October, at 8.30 a.m., and reached Brockville the same afternoon, where the train was fully made up and which here consisted of two baggage cars, seven passenger coaches, and some ten cars of freight and stock. Calls were made at Port Hope, Whitby, Toronto, and one or two minor places, which augmented the train to three cars baggage, ten coaches of passengers,—in which there were 410 souls. * * * At Chicago the first break was made; nearly a whole coach of passengers getting off at that city. There was no more left the train until St. Paul was reached when a large number got off, having tickets via Northern Pacific for Jamestown, Mapleton and Fargo. A number of freight cars were detached there. The start from St. Paul was made with three baggage cars and nine passenger coaches only, the