

lime, and 8 times as much cement as we did. Consequently I arrive at the conclusion that our mineral development, compared with that of the United States, is by no means satisfactory. And when I come to sum up the comparative development of these two countries, I find that in increase of population in a decade, our increase amounts to 18.75 against the United States' increase of 30.8. In agricultural products their production exceeds ours greatly in corn, wheat, wool, sheep, swine, fruits, wine, cotton, tobacco and sugar. In manufacture they exceed us by 5.10 per capita, in the products of industry they exceed us 2.10, in wealth they exceed us by 5.10; in debt we exceed them in the ratio of \$17.33 against \$6.82 *per capita*. In railway commerce they exceed us by 9.2 against 3.27 *per capita*; in passengers they exceed us in the ratio of 7 against 2.14 *per capita*; in earnings they exceed us by \$15.52 against \$1.75 *per capita*. Their internal commerce is 300 times as much as our commerce with them, and 170 times as much as our commerce with the world; and in mineral development they exceed us according to the statement I have given. Now, from these facts I arrive at the conclusion that our progress is not satisfactory as compared with theirs in any of the respects that go to make up the growth of a great state. I assert that but for the exodus, this country to-day would have had a population of 8,000,000 in place of 5,000,000, and the Province of Ontario would have had a population exceeding 4,000,000; and let any man picture to himself the condition of things that we should have seen to-day if the Dominion had a population of 8,000,000 in place of the condition we find actually prevailing. Now, Sir, what is the cause of this state of things? Is it lack of energy and vigor on the part of the race that inhabits this country? No, Sir, it is not. There is not a more vigorous or energetic race on this continent or in this world than the population of Canada. Canadians in the United States are everywhere making their way, and are considered the most valuable element almost in the population of that country. Let two young men go to any business house in Chicago or any other part of the west, having equal education and equal advantages, a man from Canada, and a man from the Middle or Eastern States, and in nine cases out of ten the Canadian will get the preference, simply because he is a Canadian, because of the reputation Canadians have in the United States for energy, vigor and intelligence. Well, Sir, is it on account of bad laws or institutions? No, Sir, it is not. The laws of this country are good; the institutions of this country are good. It may be that they have been badly administered in some cases; I think they have. It is our business very often to criticise the administration of affairs; but on the whole, considering the circumstances surrounding us and the difficulties confronting the administration of this country, the administration of affairs has not perhaps been so very much worse than we might suppose was inevitable. But I assert that the laws and institutions of the country are in no wise responsible for the case I present to this House and the country. Well, Sir, is it for lack of natural resources? No, it is not. Our natural resources in our fisheries, our timber, our mines, our minerals, and our soil, are enormous—resources sufficient, Sir, for one of the greatest nations of the globe. It is not for lack of resources, from want of energy or vigor in our people, it is not from any fault in our laws and institutions, that this country has not progressed as it should have done. Well, what is the cause? Why, Sir, it is defiance of natural laws; it is defiance of the requirements of geographical affinity; it is defiance of race affinity; it is defiance of the requirements of common sense; it is because we shut ourselves out from our natural markets; it is the want of continental free trade;—that is the trouble with this country.

We are told that the National Policy is a grand institution. Our friend the Minister of Finance told us the other day that

Mr. CHARLTON.

he could not sacrifice that one little feature of our policy on any consideration whatever. He told us that if we could get commercial intercourse with the United States in natural products, shut out their manufactures, and continue to foster our National Policy, we should be all right; but as for sacrificing the National Policy, it was not to be for one moment thought of; and in connection with that, the hon. Minister made an assertion that seemed to me rather astounding. He was descanting on the desirability of opening up foreign markets, and he told us in explicit terms that our cotton mills were able to find a profitable market for their products in those neutral markets where they must meet British competition on equal terms. If that be true, if they can find a profitable market in China, India, and Japan, where they must sell in competition with goods from Manchester without any advantage of tariff on their side, I want to ask why they cannot do it here—why it is necessary to have from 25 to 35 per cent. duty against those goods coming into Canada. I would like to know how that is; and I am afraid that if that is the case, this arrangement made by Secretary Fairchild, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, against the protective tariff of that country, has a vast amount of truth in it which will apply to this country. The Secretary of State says in this annual report for 1888:

"Beside the vexed economic question as to whether a country can make itself prosperous by a tariff, whether it can increase the relative average comfort of its whole people by diverting a portion of its labor and capital from the employments which could be most profitably followed under natural conditions, thereby making certain of the necessities of life more costly than they would be otherwise, there is a higher moral question which may well be asked, and that is, can a government be kept pure and free which, through the agency of its laws, offers vast pecuniary temptations to some kinds of business?"

"There are many indications that this question must be answered in the negative. There are many proofs that large classes of our business men have come to depend for success upon their skill in manipulating Governmental agencies, rather than upon industry, intelligence and honorable competition."

Does the hon. the Minister of Finance know anything about that?

"Is it not possible that eagerness for the money which men assume comes to them only through government, may lead them to use an overgrowing proportion of their gains to possess and influence the supposed source of their wealth. And will not the endeavor to make men rich soon become the chief function of our government? Is not this already the case? If these dangers exist, if they are not overestimated, then can it be doubted that the true welfare of our people calls for the rescue of the government from them as speedily as may be? This can only be done by severing government from private business; steps should at once be taken in that direction, always, however let me repeat, bearing in mind interests which may have become established under present laws; to the end that they may not suffer unduly while beneficent reforms are made."

Now, I fear that is the case in this country. I fear that these interests which seek to control the government do, in a large measure, control it; and instead of relying on their own energy, skill and capital, rely on undue favors from the Government for the profits which they seek to make. In fact, I am certain this is the case. But supposing we concede the National Policy is all it claims to be, conceding that it may actually create a home market in this country and will serve the purposes it is intended to serve, conceding all this, we have to the south of us a country that has been engaged in the same business of building up a home market for the last 25 years. During that time they have imposed heavy duties on their imports, they have fostered and created to some extent a great manufacturing interest, and I hold it would be the part of wisdom for Canada to seek access to that great market, created by the taxation of that country for 25 years, rather than undergo the expensive and not very desirable process which that country has undergone in the creation of that market. Break down the barriers, and instead of waiting 25 years to create a market in Canada, let us get access to the American market which is already created. If the National Policy is a correct policy, here is a short cut to