

value of \$2,849,269, or thirty-eight times as much to the United States as to Great Britain, with 30 cents per bushel duty on that sent to the United States and the British market free and open. That illustrates the vast importance of securing free access to that market where, notwithstanding all these circumstances, we sold thirty-eight times as much barley last year as in the British market. Of eggs, we sold to Great Britain last year the value of \$83,680, and to the United States, in the face of the 5 cent duty, the value of \$1,074,247. All these facts, and I only refer to them briefly as illustrating the point which I desire to present in a striking light before the House, illustrate the main fact I wish to present, that we are debarred from our natural market; that, in consequence, our prosperity is impaired, that our people leave us and go to that country from which our products are shut out; and if this Government wish to promote the prosperity of this country, to increase its population, to keep the people who are now dwelling here, and to retain the immigrants who come to this Dominion, they must adopt a broader and more liberal policy, a common-sense trade policy with respect to the other forty-two commonwealths on this continent not under the British flag.

I will not detain the House very much longer. I would have concluded half an hour ago, but hon. gentlemen opposite attempted to prevent me saying what I wanted to say on this matter. We want to change our trade policy, we want to reach the markets to the south of us, we want to pay less attention to the markets of other countries and more attention to that great natural market of 60,000,000 lying alongside of us. Last year we were talking about the trade with the West Indies, Mexico, Central and South America. Our exports of animals and produce to those countries last year reached \$41,929, of agricultural products \$292,355, or a total value of \$334,294. At the same time we sent these products to the United States to the value of \$11,608,000, or thirty times as much to the United States as to all these countries together. In the face of these facts it is absurd to talk about developing trade with the West Indies, Mexico, Central and South America, when those markets are so insignificant compared with the United States market. I simply reiterate that the Government should adopt a common-sense policy, that they should adopt a wise immigration policy, that they should seek to run this country in the interests of the farmer, the lumberman, the mechanic and the labourer, to govern the country so that our people will remain in this country, which is as good as any on the continent, possessing, as it does, vast resources, and all that is necessary to develop this country and increase its population as rapidly as it should increase, is to adopt a trade policy calculated to promote its interests. Before I take my seat I must reiterate my request to the Minister of Finance to produce the article he referred to, casting reflections on me, and to read it to this House, so that the House may know what the charge is, so that I may know what it is and may be in a position to answer it here as a member of this House where the charge is made against me. I want to know whether the Finance Minister proposes to do this. The allusion is made, and I want to know what it is.

Mr. BOWELL. It is on record that you said that you read it.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is on record that Baron Mammchaussen lived once and tied his horse to a steeple.

Mr. FOSTER. He has come back again.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say that the Finance Minister should read this article, so that I may have an opportunity of answering it here when the House is made acquainted with its character.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the Finance Minister is not going to defend the statement he made with regard to the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) we will have to proceed with the discussion. When the Finance Minister drew the attention of the committee to a question of order, in place of dealing with the question he went on to outline the direction in which a discussion on an important matter of this kind might take place. He challenged the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on a question of order, but in place of discussing that question when he rose in his place, he went off in every direction he could think of to outline what he conceived to be the proper discussion of a question of this kind. I contend that the whole policy of the Government on the question of immigration is before the committee in connection with this item. Had we proceeded to pass the item now before the committee, hon. gentlemen opposite might claim that since we had passed the salaries to agents at Quebec and other points, we had committed ourselves to the whole policy of the Government on immigration. We claim that now and here is the proper time to criticise the policy of the Government on this important matter. The question of our population has been referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as one of vital interest. When we come to consider the fact that within the last ten years, under the head of immigration, we have spent about \$3,000,000 to bring people into the country, and that we now find from the census that they are not here, I am sure the people of this country will consider that we are discharging a very important duty when we are drawing the attention of the House to this question. I agree in every reference made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to the vicious policy of the Government and its evil results on our population. When the Government make a country desirable to live in, and give to the people the necessities of daily life at the lowest price, and facilitate people coming to the country by free grants of land, and enable them to obtain comfortable homes, then is the time to seek for immigration; and it is not while you continue a vicious policy in force which imposes taxation upon them and makes them victims of combines and monopolies. The people will not stay here when they come, which clearly shows that the policy of the Government is responsible for the loss of our population. I am not prepared to say that the policy of the Government is entirely responsible for all the exodus; but still we must remember that when the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches were in the Opposition, they charged the exodus on the Liberal Administration, and they promised that when they got into power they would not only prevent the exodus, but would