

are physically and intellectually weak, who find life a struggle for existence, and who desire to carry on that struggle under the most favourable conditions possible. Then there are the vagrant classes, the ordinary tramp, who pays us a visit in July and August, but who, during the greater part of the year makes his home at a safe and convenient distance to the south of us. Besides there is the class—I regret to say it is a large class—that are idle, indolent, and unambitious, whose whole desire seems to be merely to exist, who are satisfied if they can maintain their existence for a whole week on a few cents' worth of corn meal and bacon, and who are content with an entire wardrobe which can be made out of a few yards of cotton cloth. This class of people naturally gravitate towards the south, and they find in those warm climates a more congenial home than they do with us in the north. But the point to which I wish now to direct the attention of the House is this: That these are the non-productive and not the productive classes; that while they add to the numerical strength of a state or a country in which they live, they add very little, or absolutely nothing to its growth or prosperity. Another point revealed by the census returns of the United States, to which I desire to call attention, is this: That the growth and prosperity of that whole country has been principally confined to the northern states; that the increase in wealth, the growth in manufactures, the activity in trade and commerce, have been almost entirely in those states which most nearly correspond with ours in geographical position, in natural resources, in climate, and other conditions; and in addition to that, the movement of population in those, which are the most prosperous states of the union, has been precisely similar to the movement of population in this Dominion of Canada. In the older states of the union, there has been the same decrease of the population in the agricultural districts, and the same increase in the cities and manufacturing towns. There has been the movement of population westward; farmers leaving the unproductive lands in the older states to take up the new lands in the west, where the soil is more fertile, where little or no capital is needed, where their labour is better rewarded, and their condition is in every respect improved. There has also been the movement to the southward to which I have alluded. Now, I do not wish to be understood as underestimating the value of population. Population is an important element of consideration in the growth or prosperity of any country. But particularly in a new country like ours where there are large tracts of land unoccupied, where there are great natural resources undeveloped, it is of the utmost importance that by every legitimate and practical means we should add to the popu-

lation of the country. But what I do wish to draw attention to is this: The difference in the value of the productive and industrial classes, as compared with the idle and unproductive classes, the difference between those who are active, industrious, energetic, thrifty, and ambitious, and between those who are idle and indolent, who seem to have no desire to accumulate wealth, or to obtain social position, but who simply try to work out the problem of existence in the easiest, and simplest, and cheapest manner possible. I wish further to impress upon the attention of the House this fact: That while we must, in considering the progress of a country, take into account the increase of its population, we cannot accept any estimate of its growth which is solely based upon the increase or decrease of its population. Such arguments are utterly valueless, unless they are supported by other and better testimony. I wish, in this connection, to point out the utter worthlessness of the arguments used by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and by many other gentlemen who have addressed us from that side of the House, and which arguments are based upon the exodus of our population. These hon. gentlemen have relied principally upon the fact that the farming population of Canada has decreased in the older provinces, and that if you take the Dominion as a whole the farming population has not increased. That is true; the census returns show it. But that does not prove that our farmers are not prosperous. We have abundance of evidence to prove the contrary. Although their numbers have not increased, yet the quantity of land in Canada under cultivation is 6,500,000 acres greater in 1891 than it was in 1881. That our farmers have increased in wealth, is proved beyond all doubt by the enormous increase in the amount of capital invested in their agricultural enterprises. As was shown by the Minister of Railways the other night, that increase has amounted to \$95,000,000 in Ontario alone. Our farmers have obtained improved and labour-saving machinery; they have adopted better methods; they have enormously increased their producing power, and in addition to this, they have a larger and better market to supply to-day than they ever had before. This market is provided by the increase of population in our cities and manufacturing centres. The returns show that the increase during ten years was 38 per cent, and that, in this way, 380,000 people have been added to that class of the population which are not producers, but consumers, of agricultural products. Under our present tariff, the farmers of Canada have the privilege of supplying this large market, and though their numbers have not increased, they are supplying that market to-day. They are giving us a better and more abundant supply than we ever