

Butterworth, it is true, are protectionists, but they desire to see the scope of free intercourse upon this continent enlarged; they desire to see a policy adopted that will be mutually beneficial and advantageous to their own country and to the Dominion of Canada. They are truly patriotic in their efforts to promote the interests, not only of the United States, but the interests of all the Anglo-Saxon commonwealths upon the continent of North America. He next refers to the income tax, and endeavors to create the impression that my hon. friend, in his reference some time ago to the income tax, had advocated a tax that would press with great severity upon all classes of people in this country, upon the artisan, upon the wage-earner, and upon every class of individuals who have any income at all. That depends entirely upon the character of the income tax; it depends entirely upon the limits to which that income tax comes down. It may be a tax upon incomes of a thousand dollars and upwards, upon two thousand and upwards—the limit of the taxable income may be so large as to affect the rich man only—and it was in that sense, as I distinctly remember, that my hon. friend referred to this question. Then we have paraded before us the old stock arguments about a home market. Protection to the industries of the country for the benefit of the farmer, forsooth! Why, what is the condition of the farmer in this country to-day? Living, Sir, in a country which is one of the dearest in the world to purchase in, and one of the cheapest in the world to sell in, so far as the products of his labor are concerned, selling the products of the soil for very much less than they were sold for during the *régime* of my hon. friend at my right, struggling with difficulties created by this very party which taxes everything that he produces and reduces the purchasing power of the natural customer to whom he sells his productions, not only increases the cost of what he purchases but diminishes the price of what he sells. Then the hon. gentleman refers to the Intercolonial Railway, and he tells us that this road has been an immense benefit. Well, in a sense it has. It has been a great benefit to certain coal mine owners; it has been an enormous benefit to the owners of the Springhill mines, and to-day this road is carrying coal for less than the bare cost of transportation, and is charging other classes of freight much higher in proportion than it charges for the transportation of coal; and in this way it is an immense benefit to the owners of the coal mines, and it discriminates in favor of those men and against the farmers and producers and other business classes of this country. It is said that the road was not built for political reasons. I combat that and I assert it was. It has cost up to this time over \$50,000,000, which is an annual incubus on the country. We lose every cent of interest on that sum, amounting to not less than \$1,500,000 a year.

Mr. MITCHELL. That arises from bad management.

Mr. CHARLTON. And in addition it costs \$300,000 or \$400,000 yearly, even with the accounts cooked and sums charged to capital that should be charged to running expenses of the road, in excess of earnings. The hon. Minister of Marine has told us that the loss in running the road in 1888 was only one-half what it was in 1878. There was a difference in the mode of keeping the accounts. In 1878 what was charged to running expenses came properly under that head, while in 1888 every dollar which by any excuse could be charged against capital account was charged there, in order to reduce nominally the cost of operating the road. Then the hon. gentleman told us that the Liberal party in this House were ashamed, at the beginning of the Session, to speak of unrestricted reciprocity. I am sure my hon. friends to my right and my left will laugh at such an assertion, because the party pledged itself to that issue last year, the party has stood by that issue every day since, and upon that issue

Mr. CHARLTON.

it stands to-day and on that issue it will stand to-morrow, and it will fight this question out on this line to the bitter end, it will go to the country on this question, and it will carry the country on it. No, we were not ashamed of this issue at the beginning of the Session, we are not ashamed of this issue now. My hon. friend has placed this resolution before the House in accordance with a decision the party arrived at within two or three days of the time we came to Ottawa. The hon. Minister informed the House that they, the Conservative party, the Government party, were still willing to make a fair and liberal treaty with the United States? Are still ready? When have they been willing to make a fair and reasonable treaty? When have they shown a disposition to meet the United States on fair, liberal and equitable terms? When have they offered any treaty on any other lines than the Treaty of 1854, which the Americans disavowed and abrogated in 1866, and which they have told us year after year ever since they never would renew on those conditions. And with the assertion staring us in the face that another treaty would not be given us on those conditions, it is little short of an insult to the common sense of hon. members to tell us that the Government party are ready to make a fair and liberal treaty and are using their utmost efforts to negotiate one. The hon. gentleman quoted from the present Secretary of State of the United States, who has repeated the statement that a treaty with Canada upon the lines of the old treaty was entirely inadmissible and was not to be thought of.

So much for the position taken by the Minister of Marine, and I pass now to the consideration of the question which comes up directly in connection with the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is a question of great importance, it is a question of greater importance than any other question that is now before the people of this country, and it is a question of greater importance than any other question which has been before this country for ten years past at least. The Minister of Finance referred to the necessity of securing wider markets, he referred to the necessity of extending our trade. And how does he propose to do it? Why, he cannot think of sacrificing the interests of that small circle of individuals who are benefited by the National Policy; he cannot think of sacrificing the interests of men who are useful in election contests, because they are directly interested in maintaining the Government in power, and are ready to pay for that interest. He must maintain the interests of those men, even if he does so at the sacrifice of the interests of nineteen-twentieths of the people of Canada. And he proposes, not to take the great market lying at our very doors, not to take the natural market with 60,000,000 of customers lying alongside of us, but he proposes to hunt up new markets, to subsidise steamship lines, to construct more railways, to reach China, Japan, India, to go to South America, to open up trade with the Argentine Republic, with Patagonia, with the West Indies, to commence trade with Samoa, with Tahiti, to open up trade with Uganda, with the Upper Congo, and other places far distant from us. Yes, that is the panacea of the hon. gentleman for the commercial distress of this country—to open up those far distant markets which it is almost impossible to reach and which are worthless when reached, and to leave the great market at our very doors, by refusing to enter into an arrangement with 60,000,000 people whereby we could secure commercial advantages which would lift this country from the condition of depression in which it at present remains. It reminds me of the story of a sea captain who, when his ship was lying at the mouth of the Amazon, and, although out of sight of land, was in the midst of an ocean of fresh water, hailed a passing vessel and asked for a supply of water. The captain said: "Throw a bucket overboard; why, you are in the midst of an ocean of fresh water." So the hon. gentleman is in the midst of an ocean