

dian. Why, Sir, we have faith in Canada: we have faith in things Canadian. We desire to promote Canada's interest; we desire to make things Canadian present a better appearance to the world than they present to-day; and in the promotion of this desire we take the liberty to point out mistakes that have been made. Is there anything wrong in that? We take the liberty to condemn blunders that have been perpetrated. Is there anything wrong in that? We take the liberty to denounce the recklessness of this Government, in piling up our debt and raising the scale of our expenditure to such a point as to tie our hands and prevent the country expanding and developing as it should. We lament and denounce the bad government of this country; and in doing all these things we do what the interests of this country demand should be done by an honest and faithful Opposition. We do these things through loyalty to Canada, through a desire to have things Canadian brought into a more prosperous condition than they are to-day; and when my hon. friend stands up as the exponent of all that is true, and just, and honest, and advises us to have more regard for things Canadian, and more faith in Canada, we cast back the advice in his teeth, and we advise him and his colleagues to adopt a policy that will make things Canadian more prosperous, and conducive to the best interests of this country in every way. In pursuance of this desire to promote the interests of Canada, we think we have discovered, and we point the people of this country to a new road to prosperity. We may be mistaken; we do not claim infallibility; but we do claim that our motives are good. Now, let us for a moment examine our ground, and if we are mistaken let it be shown; but if we have reason to believe that we are not mistaken, it is our duty to give the reasons.

In dealing with reciprocity, we are not dealing with a question which belongs purely and entirely to the realm of speculation and theory, but with a question of which we have practical knowledge. This country at one time had reciprocity, partial reciprocity, for twelve years, though not the full measure of benefit was derived from it that would be derived from unlimited reciprocity. We commenced the first year with exports from all the Provinces which constitute this Dominion amounting to \$10,473,000; in the last year they had increased to \$39,950,000, an increase of \$29,027,000 in twelve years. Since the abrogation of that treaty twenty-four years have elapsed, and last year the exports from the same provinces of Canada to the United States amounted to \$40,522,000, an increase over 1866 of only \$572,000. While we had an average annual increase under reciprocity of \$2,418,000, we had an average annual increase without reciprocity during the twenty-four years from 1866 to 1890 of only \$23,800; or the increase of our exports under reciprocity were one hundred-fold greater than they have been since reciprocity has been denied to this country. You cannot get over that argument. If our exports had continued to increase in the same ratio that they did from 1854 to 1866, they would be to-day \$98,000,000, instead of \$40,000,000; and, under the new order of things which have been brought about by the McKinley Bill on the other side, and the policy of restriction adopted on this side, we are likely to find our

Mr. CHARLTON.

exports to the United States falling below the limit of 1866; we are likely to have a smaller export of our productions to that great country of 65,000,000 inhabitants than we had in 1866, when it had only 35,000,000 inhabitants.

Now, let me ask the question: Would unrestricted reciprocity be desirable? I might combine that with the question: Would tariff lines between all the provinces of this Dominion be desirable? Would it be desirable to have a tariff line between Ontario and Quebec, another between Quebec and New Brunswick, another between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia? No man of common sense would say so; every man would say no. Well, if the United States, when they became a nation, had divided their country into groups of states and had established tariff lines between those groups, would the development of that country have been as great as it has been? Suppose the New England States, the Southern States and the Western States had all been formed into groups of states with tariff lines separating them, no man would suppose that that country would have attained the greatness it has. Well, I would ask what difference would there be in nature, in geography, in commerce, between tariff lines drawn between the various provinces of this Dominion and a tariff line between these provinces and the United States? What difference is there between a tariff line between Ontario and Quebec and one between Ontario and New York? This difference: that the tariff line between Ontario and New York is twenty times more disastrous than would such a line be between Ontario and Quebec, because the market of New York is twenty times more important to us than the market of Quebec. If we group the provinces of this Dominion, we shall find that the different groups show geographical and business affinities with groups of states. The natural market of the Maritime Provinces is with New England and the seaboard states, and any policy that deprives these countries of free intercourse with each other is disastrous to both. We find that Ontario and Quebec naturally belong commercially to the New England and the Middle States group, and any policy that prevents them freely trading with each other is disastrous to both. So Manitoba and the North-West Territories are naturally a part of the Mississippi Valley, and anything that impedes free intercourse between those sections is disastrous to both. British Columbia on the west and the States of the Pacific slope naturally constitute a geographical group, and any restriction in trade between those sections is disastrous to either section. Therefore I maintain, and the Liberal party maintain, that if free trade between forty-four commonwealths works well, it will work better if extended to fifty-one commonwealths: it will confer equal advantages on the seven provinces of Canada than it has conferred upon the forty-four States of the American Union. I might go on to expand this subject still further, but I forbear, because I have already consumed a great deal of time.

Now, what is the issue before the people of this country to-day? It is an issue between protection and dry-rot on a small scale on the one hand, and enlarged continental free trade between all the English-speaking commonwealths in America on the other hand. That is the issue, Sir, and I wish to impress, if I could do so, upon the mind of the hon. Minis-