

eve to go through them all, and I will confine myself strictly on the present occasion to four capital errors which that gentleman has made. First of all, I would ask the hon. gentleman, if there is anything in the statement which he wishes to correct. I am using the statement made by the "Empire," which also appears verbatim et literatim, in the columns of the "Globe" and "Mail," and when "Empire" "Mail" and "Globe" all unite in representing that the hon. gentleman made a particular set of statements, I think we may assume that these are approximately correct. Nevertheless, if on consideration there is anything the hon. gentleman wants to explain or to withdraw, heaven forbid that I should deny him the opportunity of doing it now and here. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman does not want to qualify, if he adheres to his statements, allow me to point out what appears to me to be very extraordinary mistakes to be made on the part of a gentleman in his position. Now, Sir, I assure the hon. gentleman that on this side of the House, at any rate, we are not disposed to be very exacting; we do not expect a Premier or a Minister of Justice to be an expert in statistics. That, I think, would be unreasonable. But, Sir, I humbly submit—as Sir Charles Tupper was wont to say, I am in the judgment of the House—is it too much to expect that a Minister of the Crown, ay, the First Minister of the Crown, should, before addressing an audience on a question of first-rate importance, condescend to make himself acquainted with the rules of subtraction, multiplication and division? I do not expect too much. Now, being, as I have said, disposed on this occasion not to censure, but rather to instruct, I would like, did the rules of the House permit, to have asked for a blackboard and chalk, but I have been withheld by a fear lest my motives should be misconstrued; for as you can understand I have always been nervously anxious not to be misconstrued by hon. gentlemen opposite. But I will endeavour, without these mechanical aids, to explain wherein I think the hon. gentleman has grievously misconstrued the statistics which his own department has placed in his hands. In the first place, I find that the hon. gentleman states that the population has grown in the last decade some seventeen per cent. Now, I want to call his attention to these facts. Our population in 1881 was 4,324,000. If he will divide that number by ten, he will find that ten per cent represents 432,000 people; if he will pursue the same method with respect to the seven per cent, he will find that it represents about 302,000 people; and if he will add these two numbers together, he will find that they will make 734,000 at least. Sir, his own Canada increased 504,000; where does he get census returns tell us that the population of the odd 230,000? Sir, I would be obliged to know that the census returns are all a blunder, and the hon. gentleman is correct in saying that there are seventeen per cent additional population, being 230,000 more than his own

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

census returns show; but, until some explanation is offered, all I have to say is, that there is apparently a trifling error of 230,000, which, taken in the percentage fashion which the hon. gentleman is so fond of, means a trifling error of forty-six per cent. This, you will observe, was a patriotic error, no doubt committed with the desire of preventing people from supposing that the exodus had been as great as it really is, and it is very likely many people throughout the country who read the hon. gentleman's statement that there had been an increase of 17 per cent in the last decade, whereas, his own census returns showed an increase of about 11½ per cent, would go home feeling comforted that some wonderful discovery had been made which showed the census returns to be entirely erroneous. The hon. gentleman also talks about the exodus, which he puts down at 265,500. But let me tell the hon. gentleman that we on this side always considered the exodus to consist of two parts—one composed of the native-born population who had left Canada, and the other composed of people who had, according to the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, come from abroad and settled here, brought at our expense, and who afterwards left our shores. As to these what has the hon. gentleman to say? Not one word, not one syllable. The trifling fact that 886,000 people were alleged by the returns of the Government of which he was a member, and for which he is responsible to have settled in Canada in the last decade, and to have subsequently disappeared, appears to the hon. gentleman to be unworthy of the slightest notice. Now, I will make the hon. gentleman an offer, a fair and reasonable offer. If in his place as Prime Minister he will rise here now and state that, having examined into the question, he has become convinced that all the statements made by the Government from 1881 to 1891 with respect to the settlement of immigrants in Canada are a sham and a delusion and a fraud, and that the money paid for those people was practically obtained from us by false pretenses, and was never used to bring immigrants at all, then I will say that possibly he was right to omit all reference to the 886,000 emigrants that the hon. gentleman's Government went on declaring, in spite of my protests, year in and year out, had been added by their exertions to the population of Canada. Now, Sir, what are the broad facts? You have an increase of population, all told, of 504,000; you have an immigration alleged to have been brought to Canada of 886,000. Does the hon. gentleman understand what these facts mean? They mean that we have absolutely lost 382,000, plus the entire natural increase. Does the hon. gentleman want to know, or do his friends or their subsidized press want to know, what was the result of our expenditure of three or four millions of dollars for the alleged purpose of bringing these settlers here? Sir, I can tell them. These same census returns