

In 1896, the item was \$991,735. I do not suppose the present government would lay claim to that; they would rather charge that to the late government. In 1897, the item was \$1,237,000. They had not only nearly reached but exceeded those of 1892.

In 1898 they were....	\$1,008,000
In 1899 " "	993,000
In 1900 " "	1,057,994
In 1901 " "	1,166,533

Compare those ten years, and you will find that the exports of settlers' effects from the country were greater during the last five years than for the five years previously. Yet we are told, with a good deal of solemnity—and I was going to say something else, but it would not be considered parliamentary—that in the last five years, the exodus has not been so great. There is a census taken in Manitoba every five years, and what does that show? There was a census taken in Manitoba in 1896, exactly the middle of the decade. Comparing its figure with those of 1891, and then with those of 1901, it shows the rate of increase was practically the same in the earlier and later years, so that there has been no great influx into that country until the present year, after the enormous harvest. The Postmaster General is not only master of letters and newspapers, but is also a publisher. I do not know that he edits the 'Labour Gazette.' I fancy he just controls it, but you will find in that Gazette a reference to the great exodus from the maritime provinces in particular and if you look at the last address of the Governor of Nova Scotia, on the opening of parliament, you will find that he uses this language—he mentioned the fact of the great enterprise which they had at Sydney, and trusted that this and similar undertakings would tend to stop the exodus of our young men to the United States. Yet these gentlemen would lead the public to believe, by this paragraph of the address, that the young men of the Dominion were not emigrating to the United States, but were remaining in Canada. If the hon. gentlemen would take the trouble to look at the census which was taken a short time ago in the eastern States, to which the maritime province men generally go, fishermen and others, while others go still further west, you will find that in 1880—that is the decennial census return—there were 717,157

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

Canadians in the Eastern States, and in 1890 there were 980,927, and by the last census of 1900, the figures had gone up to 1,181,778. With these facts upon record, we have the statement made in the address, or rather we have words put into the mouth of His Excellency, the truth of which cannot be verified by any facts or figures in existence. In the State of Massachusetts another census has been taken, and what does it show? That in 1885 there were 147,352 Canadians; in 1890 there were 207,000; in 1895 there were 243,000, and in 1900 there were 293,000 in that state, showing a constant increase in the number of people leaving Canada for the United States. I do not say that this did not exist under former administrations. It is the peculiar character of the Anglo-Saxon race to be roaming. They are never satisfied; they are going from place to place. Families are raised, and the boys, imbued with the same ideas as their parents, leave their homes and go forth to seek their fortunes somewhere else. Had it not been for that spirit of enterprise, I should not have been here to-day. My father thought he could do better here than he could in England, and he brought his family, myself among them, and I am very glad, as an evidence of the salubrity and healthfulness of this climate, to say that of the four children he brought to this country 67 years ago, we are all alive and kicking to-day.

Hon. Mr. TEMPLEMAN—Especially kicking.

Hon. Mr. O'DONOHUE—Are they all in Canada?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—They are all in Canada. Two of them are living in Tweed, Hungerford, and another in Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—Are they all Conservatives?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Yes. I have dealt with that portion of the address referring to the census, and I think that the facts will convince the public that that was altogether a superfluous and unnecessary paragraph to place in the address.

What the next paragraph means I am at a loss to know, unless I am to draw from