

is pertinent to the question of promoting immigration to this country, of increasing our population and developing our resources. I wish to point out the bearing of that repressive policy upon the interests of the country in diminishing its population and in retarding its growth. I desire to point out that the trade with Canada and the United States has remained stationary for twenty-five years, that the annual exports from this country to the United States in 1891 were probably a million less than they were in 1866.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must call the hon. gentleman to order. I do not think he is regarding the ruling of the Chair. If he persists, I shall have to call Mr. Speaker.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Call the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. CHARLTON. Am I to understand that I must drop this branch of the question?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That is my ruling, and I ask the committee to sustain me in that ruling.

Mr. CHARLTON. And I shall ask the House to sustain me in my right to discuss this branch of the question. I do not propose to be gagged in this House of Commons in a proper and pertinent discussion of the question, unless the House decides that I am wrong.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, heard the discussion which went on a few moments ago, in which his own friends indicated the bearing which might be given to the question under discussion. I am sure if he will discuss any question directly bearing upon the question before the committee, the House would be very sorry to see him restrained. When this point was raised, the hon. gentleman was taking a latitude which, as I said before, would justify the introduction of any question at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was about to proceed to demonstrate that the particular line of fiscal policy I was speaking of did diminish the population of this country, did have a direct bearing on the question of the development of our resources and the increase of our population. I was not allowed to reach that point. I would have demonstrated that it had a direct bearing, and was a most pertinent illustration. I was permitted to go so far, and then I was shut off.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Go on.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no desire to occupy the time of the House unnecessarily. I have no desire to introduce matter irrelevant to the subject under discussion. I have a line laid out, and I wish to proceed on it to demonstrate certain assertions I have made with respect to the loss of population. I trust I may be allowed to make the statement I desire to make. I was proceeding to say that the fiscal policy of this Government as it relates to our intercourse with the United States has been of a character to diminish the growth of trade between these two countries, and that the exports to the United States were actually less now than in 1866. I intended to proceed from that point to show that with continued free trade the increase of trade between the two countries would have been enormous, that the prosperity of this country from the increase of trade would have been very great, and

Mr. CHARLTON.

that the repressive policy of this Government, acting in conjunction with the repressive policy of the United States Government, has been the means of repressing our energies, of driving our population from us, in short of interfering with our growth. If this is not a matter pertinent to the discussion of this question, why surely no matter can be. Notwithstanding the efforts to destroy the trade between these countries, our total trade with the United States last year was actually \$3,000,000 more than our trade with Great Britain; and had our exports to the United States increased since 1866 in the same proportion they increased from 1854 to 1866, under a partial reciprocal tariff, in the place of exporting a value of \$41,000,000, we would have exported \$101,000,000 and \$60,000,000 more would have been brought into this country, in the shape of gold or its equivalent, resulting from our exports to the United States than we have received. I would ask if, assuming as true that we lost \$60,000,000 of exports through a given line of policy, that policy has not some bearing on the growth of our prosperity and on the increase of population in this country? It has more bearing on this question than this vote of \$198,000—it has more bearing than twenty votes of that amount. It is the policy of the Government, the policy of repression, the policy that denies this country its natural markets, the policy of hostility to our neighbours, that accounts in a large measure for the fact that our population is 4,800,000 instead of 8,000,000 as it should be. This is a question of the utmost importance to this country, and it is pertinent, proper and relevant to consider it to-night.

We have a certain line of productions in this country for which we find our export market in the United States, and I wish in connection with this immigration question to show how important it would be to this country, if we had free and unimpeded access to that market, for, notwithstanding the policy of repression, we are obliged to sell in that market at great disadvantage to ourselves. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to this branch of the subject, and he will be then able to judge more clearly as to what policy it is necessary to pursue in order to promote the interests of the country and to increase its population. And you, Mr. Chairman, will appreciate the force of this as a practical farmer, although you are a professional man, and I will now take the trade returns and show the movement of trade in certain articles between this country and the United States and other countries. I take exports of horses, sheep, poultry, eggs, hides, wool, barley, beans, hay, malt, potatoes, vegetables and flax. Last year we exported these articles to the United States to the value of \$9,355,531. We exported to Great Britain, where there is a free market, whereas in the United States the bars are up and we had to climb over them, to the value of \$830,867, or twelve times as much to the United States as to Great Britain. During the previous year, when the McKinley Bill had not gone into operation, we exported to the United States the value of \$14,124,801, to Great Britain the value of \$427,876, or thirty-four times the value of those articles to the United States as to Great Britain. When we talk about two-rowed barley, hon. members must remember that we sent to Great Britain last year barley to the value of \$75,225, probably all two-rowed barley, and to the United States the