

only with difficulty, and then with an Irish accent. The hon. member for Brant has, by statistics, endeavored to prove to the House and the country that the population of the Dominion has not increased, but even decreased. He should have compared the Census of 1871 with that of 1881, and he would have found that every Province has increased, and increased largely. The increase in Prince Edward Island, which is isolated, and does not receive much immigration, showed an increase of 15 $\frac{8}{10}$  per cent.; Nova Scotia, 13 $\frac{6}{10}$ ; New Brunswick, 12 $\frac{4}{10}$ ; Quebec, 14 $\frac{6}{10}$ ; Ontario, 18 $\frac{6}{10}$ ; or an average of 16 per cent. The increase altogether has been over half a million (573,000).

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is what I said. The increase is for ten years.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But the conclusion which the hon. gentleman drew was that our population is not increasing; that the country is not prosperous and contented; that it is a poor country, and I am sorry to say the hon. gentleman sought to disparage the country. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has taken this course, because his speech will be read. The public will say that a leading member of the Opposition has thus spoken, and they will quote his speech. It will also be quoted, doubtless, on the other side of the lines, and published in pamphlet form, and circulated throughout the country as an immigration pamphlet, which will be very useful to the United States. But I should have thought the hon. gentleman, for once during this Session, or during this Parliament, would have found something good to say of Canada. Let us take any of the speeches of the hon. gentleman, let us put them all together, let us take from them what he says of Canada, and we will not find in them one word favourable to Canada. He is always despondent and discouraged, and wants to discourage others. Well, if the hon. gentleman loses courage in that way, he should not, at all events, try to communicate that want of moral courage to others. He must see that, at all events, there are some thousands of people in this country—last year there were 133,000 of them—who think otherwise, who have come into this country and settled here and are remaining here. The hon. gentleman must see that his despondency is not shared by the people of this country. He says that the people are borne down by taxes, and that we are taking away the hard earnings of labourers and mechanics, which should remain with them, otherwise they must go to the United States. The hon. gentleman must see that there is no such feeling in the country; that the people are perfectly satisfied with their present position. There will be, at times, as you will find at the most prosperous times, people who are not prosperous, who are not wise—people who will import too largely and will fail. There will be others who are not careful about their credits, who give away their goods and scatter them through the country, and when the time comes to get their payments they are unable to get them and have to close their doors and go down. But that is not the general rule. It is true that at this moment the revenues of the country are not so large as they were two or three years ago; but I do not think we should complain bitterly, when we know that one of the strongest reasons is, that the people have learned by the past that they should be more careful, that they should not import so much, that they should curtail their expenses, that they should be more prudent; that all years are not similar, that after a certain number of years of great prosperity, you always have a few years of adversity or reaction, but that, after that reaction, the good years will come again. We read in the Sacred Book, that in that country where now the British army is fighting hard battles, after seven years of great prosperity, there were seven years of great distress, and that the people were taught—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They had no Tilley there.

Mr. MILLS. And no National Policy.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There may not have been a National Policy, but there was a good policy, and that was to save for the bad years, and the people are doing this now—they are saving for the bad years. And what have we done? We have saved those large surpluses to pay the debts of the country. True, we have been paying a large portion of the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway out of those surpluses; we have paid for those great works which were required for the country in that way, and thus if the people have given us a revenue it has gone back to them in these works, and the money has been expended in the country. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman wishes to take the part of the operatives and the mechanics. He is a father to all these operatives. He does not wish them to suffer; we are their oppressors—he is their benefactor and protector! But, Mr. Speaker, where are the petitions from the operatives and the mechanics? Have they complained to the House that we have been crushing them by taxes to such an extent that they could not live and must leave the country?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to my hon. friend, and there is the best proof of that in the bye-elections which have been held lately; the people have returned men to support this Government. See what they have done since the last general election. Has the Government gone down in their favour? Have they found their strength smaller in this country than at that period? Have we lost caste with them? Have they found fault with us? Did they show it at the polls? No; they have supported our candidates and returned them to the House; and the Government is in the proud position of being able to say, with all their great measures, and, as hon. gentlemen opposite will say, difficult measures to pass, nevertheless these measures have been sanctioned by the people, and they have sanctioned them by sending other representatives here to support us. I will not detain the House longer, but I wished to show, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that there are two sides to this question. The bright side of the question is the one which we have shown. It is the true side of the question; it is the side which the people say and know to be perfectly true and correct. They know that this Government represents their views; that with the support of Parliament, it has given them the years of prosperity which they have had—the great era of prosperity which has followed the era of adversity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no doubt about it; the hon. gentleman may cry, hear, hear, but he knows very well that instead of the deficits of a number of years we have had large surpluses. That is an undeniable fact; it is a matter of history. The figures are there, and the money came into the public Treasury, and if it were not the case, how is it that hon. gentlemen have been saying, and are now saying, that we are grinding the people, and keeping them down with taxes? It is because they see the money has come into the public Treasury, and that after these deficits we have had surpluses; but the people have paid them with cheerfulness, because they knew it was for the good of the country; they know that the country is prosperous, and they have come forward and paid a shilling a head more than they used to pay, when they know that they are earning one dollar more than before. I will vote against the amendment.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman one question. He has laid a good deal of stress upon the fact that the money is spent in the country. What is the reason for building vessels in Lockport, New York, in-