

with a bountiful harvest, particularly in the county he represented. The exodus from other counties must have been greater than from Inverness, because there was no county in the Province less affected by changes in trade. This, he thought, was satisfactory evidence of the melancholy fact that the exodus of the people from the Province of Nova Scotia was on the increase; and it was a sad commentary on the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, a policy which, to use the words of the famous resolution of the hon. leader of the Government, was not only to retain in our country our countrymen, but to cause our expatriated countrymen to return.

Mr. HACKETT said hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, in their efforts to make it appear that there was a terrible exodus from those Provinces, were most industrious in collecting evidence. He knew that some people were leaving the Maritime Provinces for the United States; but why? In order to join their friends there, who had gone during the administration of affairs by hon. gentlemen opposite. He knew instances of farmers who had left Prince Edward Island in 1876 and 1877 for the United States, who had bettered their condition there, and who had written to their friends to sell out their property and join them. They were not driven out by the National Policy. He knew young men who, last year, had given up good positions worth \$40 a month, had gone to Colorado in the hope of making much more; but he expected them soon to come back. It mattered not whether a man went to the United States on business or pleasure, he was set down as an emigrant, forced to leave by the National Policy. He had travelled recently to Boston, with his wife and two children, on the line of steamers to which reference had been made; and he supposed he and his family had been put down as emigrants, driven out of the country by the National Policy.

Mr. SHAW said that too much had been made out of the emigration from Canada to the United States. He had occasion to visit Manitoba, and proceeded there by way of Duluth. He returned by way of the St. Paul and Minneapolis Railway, and on the cars there came a United States agent, who took a list of the passengers, enquiring where they came from. He (Mr. Shaw) stated that he came from Ontario, and had been in Manitoba; and he inferred that people who had gone from Ontario into Manitoba and returned to the United States were emigrants to that country. The agent had a book prepared with a list; and as the hon. members for South and Centre Huron, together with two County Court Judges in Ontario, were on board, they, together with himself (Mr. Shaw), were all entered as emigrants to the United States. He would like to know from the hon. members for Centre and South Huron whether their names were not also taken.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No.

Mr. HUNTINGTON said he would like to know, from the Finance Minister down to the youngest member of this House, whether that practice prevailed a few years ago when hon. gentlemen were crying aloud and bewailing that there was an exodus from this country. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had been here he would have arisen and given the House the benefit of his experience and would have shown that he was not driving the people out of this country. The hon. gentleman from Prince (Mr. Hackett) who had spoken just now had explained to the House how it was that there was no exodus going on, except a few friends left behind of the many whom the Mackenzie Government had driven out of the country. The discussion of that question should be approached in a spirit above party, for it was one which, if based on facts at all, was a serious matter, and one which demanded serious

Mr. MACDONNELL (Inverness).

consideration. If the fact was as stated a few years ago by the right hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government, that the exodus prevailed because the taxes were not high enough, and if although he has since been in power and raised the taxes, believing he could pin the people to the soil, then, the right hon. gentleman having tried his remedy and failed, hon. gentlemen opposite should acknowledge that their denunciation of the policy which they said was driving the people out of the country was a mistake; they should arise and seek to remove the impression they created then, and acknowledge it was a mistaken policy by which they attempted to remove the evil. He was amazed at the Finance Minister, who had a reputation which he thoroughly accorded to the hon. gentleman, of being a man who ought to be, and could be, if he was living in good company, a candid and fair man. He thought when the question was introduced that hon. members would rise above party, for if they could not rise above the influence of partizanship the fact was not creditable to the House, and that the Finance Minister would offer some reasonable explanation; that he would admit there was an exodus and that he was sorry for it. Instead of doing that the hon. gentleman rose and spoke about some steamship information by which he declared he was able to know some people had returned to St. John. Did the hon. gentleman wish the House to know that the body of emigration was in our favor? Did he wish the House to understand that our expatriated countrymen were returning? If not, why should he have referred to the fact at all. Why should he not have dealt fairly and candidly with this question, instead of in a captious and pettifogging spirit? Why did he not admit that the remedies had not been successful, and that the people had not been kept in the country, instead of making a statement in which he was careful not to commit himself to the statement which he dare not make—that the National Policy was keeping the people in the country and remedying the misfortunes which existed during the hard times which went before. Hon. gentlemen opposite had had plenty of opportunity for trying their remedial measures. They have had years of prosperity, such as the Mackenzie Government never enjoyed. They have had those years of prosperity, having come into power under the promise that they would remedy the evils which were said to exist, the chief of which was an exodus of our people, and which continues with an increasing tide under the National Policy; yet the Finance Minister rises with a bundle of papers and declares that policy is justified because a certain number of people have returned to St. John, though he knows they are only a fraction of the people who have gone from there as well as elsewhere. Hon. gentlemen opposite state that the people should not believe statements made about the exodus. But it was the duty of statesmen to look at facts as they exist, and to find remedies for evils, and if hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches found that the same state of things exists to-day, as existed when they were in Opposition, and that the National Policy had done nothing to relieve it, it should occur to the Finance Minister whether there were not some people in the country whose position should be ameliorated, and who should be wed, as it were, to the country, besides the manufacturers to whom the hon. gentleman had given so much attention.

Mr. POPE (Compton) said that when the statements of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who talked about the exodus from this country were disproved, in respect to one part of the country, they had to go down to St. John. Not one month ago they were declaring from the house-tops, on every occasion, that the exodus was from Port Huron, but there is not a word about Port Huron to-day. The Port Huron question was settled.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.