

is undoubtedly too high. I find, Sir, that the debt of of Canada exceeds that of the United States by \$9.65 per head, or 36 per cent. Now, the United States debt is rapidly decreasing; there was a reduction of \$15,000,000 last month, and the reduction during the present year will probably be more than \$100,000,000. We may reasonably suppose that in three years from this time that debt will not exceed \$1,300,000,000, or a *per capita* charge on the present population of \$23.63; while we may assume with equal certainty that within the next three or four years our own net public debt will reach the sum of \$200,000,000, or a *per capita* charge upon the present population of \$44.44, or in three years from this time it will be within a fraction of double that of the United States. I have no doubt that when the three years have elapsed we will find that the net charge is double, *per capita*, that of the United States, which will be a very bad showing for this country indeed. The interest charge per head was 95 cents in the United States for the past year, while it is \$.75 per head in Canada, an excess of interest charge in Canada of 80 cents per head, or an excess of 84 per cent. as compared with that of the United States. Now, Sir, it is but a few years ago—I do not remember the exact number, but not more than six years ago, certainly—when the case was reversed and when the interest charge in the United States exceeded that in Canada. It is only five or six years since the orbits of the two countries crossed; and since that time our interest charge has been increasing over that of the United States until to-day it is 84 per cent. greater. I will not trouble the House further with comparisons. These figures challenge attention.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. An hon. gentleman says, "Yes." So they do, Mr. Speaker. The fact that the annual expenditure of this country has increased in the last five years over \$8,300,000 as compared with an increase of \$365,000 in the preceding five years; the fact that notwithstanding the great increase of taxation the public debt of this country is rapidly advancing in volume; the fact that the policy of the Government is distasteful to a large portion of the people of this country in the matter of its Syndicate contract, in the matter of its partnership lately entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the matter of its land policy—all these facts are producing their legitimate and natural result; and, Sir, there will doubtless be a greater exodus from Canada in the present year than this country has ever seen before. Rumours of this come from every part of the West. From my own riding I hear that sixty families are moving from one township to the United States; I hear that the very best men in that Province are moving, not to the North-West, but to the United States. I hear complaints coming from all parts of the West, that the country is ruined, that it is no longer prudent to remain in this country, that the Government of the day are involving it in difficulties so great that the property of this country must continue to decrease in value, and that its development and prosperity are likely to be arrested if this policy is continued. That feeling, Sir, is producing its natural results; that feeling, Sir, is one that is going to produce disaster in this country, and, unfortunately, that feeling has, to a certain extent, good ground for its existence; unfortunately, Sir, the management, or rather the mismanagement of the affairs of this country, has been so reckless and has increased the taxation so largely, and the prospective increase of the public debt is so great, that business men deem it only prudent to flee from the wrath to come. I think, Sir, that we ought to do something to avert the ruin to which we are hastening. I shall not detain the House any longer, but move the following amendment:

That all the words after "that" in the said motion be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—

Mr. CHARLTON.

The Expenditure for 1878, was \$23,503,158.25;—that the Estimates for 1884 amount to \$32,009,747.48, that the increase of expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund between 1878 and the succeeding years, is as follows:—

1879 increase over 1878.....	\$ 952,223 31
1880 " "	1,347,476 20
1881 " "	1,999,396 17
1882 " "	3,553,945 33
1883 " "	5,226,999 20
Estimates of 1884 " "	8,506,589 13

That the expenses of Dominion Land Surveys, amounting to \$652,000 in the Estimates of 1884, which are charged to Capital Account, are of a character more properly chargeable to Income, as was done in 1878; and they increase the excess of expenditure over that year to \$9,058,589.13.

That the revenue from Customs for the year 1878 was \$12,782,824, being a tax of \$15.60 per head of a family on the estimated population of Canada in 1878, while the revenue from Customs for the year 1883 was \$23,009,582, being a tax of \$25.70 per head of a family on the estimated population of Canada in 1883.

That a very large proportion of the expenditure consists of fixed charges, or charges of a permanent character, which, when once created, are difficult of reduction.

That recent legislation, and the completion of existing engagements will result in a large increase of the public debt, and a steady increase of the public charges.

That this House views with regret the great increase in the burdens imposed upon the people by Customs duties, and the undue and rapid increase of the expenditure.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Speaker, if such statements as have been made by the hon. member had been presented to the House for the first time, and had not been many times answered, I would have felt it to be my duty to have occupied more time in answering them than I think it necessary at this late period of the Session; and I think I will meet the wishes of the House by dealing with them as briefly as possible, and by taking up only a few of the leading points in order to show the fallacy of those statements. The hon. gentleman has drawn a contrast between taxation in the United States and taxation in Canada. The hon. gentleman had a perfect right to do so, and this course could not be objected to, because in dealing with the condition of our country it is quite natural we should consider it as compared with that of the country lying alongside of it. If the hon. gentleman had confined himself to the statements he made on that subject, instead of launching out to speak of the dissatisfaction that existed in his locality with respect to the state of affairs in Canada driving, as he says, people out of the country by hundreds and thousands, he would have acted more wisely, and he would have shown more patriotism than he has shown on this and former occasions. It must be borne in mind that the condition of Canada differs very materially from that of the United States. The General Government contributes nothing whatever to the support of the different States. Under our constitution it is provided that a very large proportion of the money required for education, railways and bridges, and other objects, which otherwise would compel direct taxation, is furnished by the Dominion Government and the Provinces are relieved to that extent of taxation. I recollect when visiting the United States some years ago, in conversation with a friend relative to the taxation of the country, he said the taxation of the General Government was nothing compared with the State and local taxation; and he brought out a statement to show that he paid that year no less than 3 per cent. on the value of his property for local and State taxes. We have comparatively no direct taxation in this country for Provincial purposes. The different Provinces are sustained very largely out of the subsidies granted by the Dominion Government, for which the people generally are taxed; and if the hon. gentleman had been fair and desired that the country should occupy its true position in the eyes of our American neighbours and the outside world, he would have said that it is but right I should point out that such difference between the taxation in the two countries is more apparent than real. It would have been better for the hon. gentleman had he