

per head. The United States pays 180·6 per head for pensions more than we do. It is an abnormal and not a permanent charge, and if we set this aside it would leave our *per capita* expenditure \$2 greater than the expenditure of the United States and the various State governments combined. I do not think the comparison is a favorable one to us. The lesson furnished to us is a suggestive one, and that lesson is that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance does really need to practice economy for we are on the high road to difficulties. The hon. Minister draws a rosy picture of our condition because he is able to point out that our debt *per capita* is not so much as it is in France or Belgium and other European countries, which are ground down to the earth by the expense of maintaining vast armies. These countries are continually preparing for war and practically live in a state of war every year. Their population is ground down by all the burdens that can possibly be imposed upon them; and yet forsooth, the Minister of Finance says we should congratulate ourselves because our condition is not quite so bad as theirs. I do not know that I need waste more time on this question, I had some more figures bearing on it but I may say that the conclusions drawn by my friend the Minister of Finance will not bear investigation, and that our condition as compared with the United States in matters relating to the finances of the two countries is an unfavorable one.

Mr. FOSTER. Your figures and mine about taxation are just the same.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am aware that in some respects they are, but you attempted to draw conclusions from them that were in no wise warranted by the facts. Our railways show a still greater disparity in the development of the two countries. We carried in 1887 upon our railways 16,356,335 tons of freight; of this freight 2,580,000 was carried by the Canada Southern, and 6,458,000 by the Grand Trunk Railway. It would be a moderate estimate to assume that 3,000,000 of this freight was freight in transit through Canada from one part of the United States to the other, leaving the actual transit of freight in Canada about 13,300,000 tons. That same year the United States railways carried 552,074,752 tons, and we have therefore this result, that the carriage of freight in Canada was 3·27 tons per head and in the United States it was 9·12 tons per head, or about three times as much freight on the railways in the United States as upon Canadian railways. The number of passengers carried upon the railways of Canada was 10,608,638, and the passengers carried upon the United States railways amounted to 428,225,573, or 2·14 in Canada to 7 per head in the United States, again about three times the volume of passenger trade in the United States than there was in Canada. The total earnings of the railways in Canada was \$38,842,000 and on the United States railways \$931,385,154, so that the railways in Canada earned \$7·75 per head as compared with \$15·52 in the United States. We have the advantage of the United States in our railway system in one respect, for we have \$129,810,000 of Government money in our railways or \$26 *per capita*, while in the United States they have only \$65,000,000 invested, or \$1·08 per head, and that is not a subsidy but a loan. The statistics which I have quoted must prove pretty clearly that in the matter of the development of our trade, in the matter of increase of population, in the matter of debt burden, and in all the particulars which I have mentioned the comparison between the two countries show that it is not favorable to our country, and that a condition of things prevails here which we should not desire. I do not parade the fact for the sake of deriving any satisfaction from it, but it is necessary for us to face the situation, and to know exactly our condition, and in making our calculations we should know what is necessary to be done. We want to know exactly the basis

upon which our calculation should be made, and recognising the necessity for this knowledge it is perfectly proper that we should examine the question in this sense.

I referred a short time ago to the vast internal commerce of the United States, and I referred to that as proof of the great advantages derived by that country from unrestricted commercial intercourse between all those States. No more striking proof of this can be had than the statement made in the report that the internal commerce between the States was two and a-half times greater than the total export and import trade of the entire world in 1880. It was twenty-five times greater than the foreign commerce of the United States, import and export, which in 1886 was \$1,314,960,000. It was thirty times greater *per capita* than the commerce between Canada and the United States. I say that this vast internal commerce is one, which if we are wise, we should desire to enter into and to obtain the benefit of.

Mr. HAGGART. Where did you get those figures as regards the internal trade?

Mr. CHARLTON. From the report of Mr. Switzler, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the United States on the Internal Commerce of the United States for 1887, page 570.

I have just one more item of comparison to make between the trade of those two countries. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance was kind enough to refer to me the other night in very friendly and kindly terms in connection with my labors on the Mining Commission of Ontario, and he stated, as was true, that in that capacity I had been able to have my ideas as to the great extent and capabilities of this country, in a mineral sense, very much enlarged. I had. I found that we have enormous mineral resources. I was glad to see how widely they are extended and how great they were, and I found out another thing also; I found from Ottawa to Port Arthur, wherever I went, one universal cry—and there was not a dissenting voice to that cry—on the part of every man interested in minerals, copper, iron silver, gold, and structural materials. They all said: "Give us access to the American markets, we are languishing for the want of a market; we are cribbed, cabined and confined; our energies are repressed and we can do nothing. Right across the line are unlimited markets for the products of our mines, but we are debarred from that market by the trade restrictions that exist between the two countries." I heard this complaint so often repeated that I finally became aware—and I am sure that a very few men of this country are fully aware of it—of the vast importance of this question as regards the mineral development of this country. No other great interest in Canada is suffering so severely or would be benefited so greatly by the removal of trade restrictions as the mining interests of this Dominion. Now, what is the state of our mineral development as compared with that of the United States? In Mr. Coste's report we find it stated that the mineral production of Canada last year was \$15,000,000; but he includes in that statement brick, coke, iron, steel and tiles. As iron, he gives both the ore and the iron; one is a duplicate of the other. The American report gives neither iron, nor coke, nor steel, nor tiles nor brick; and when we eliminate these articles from Mr. Coste's report for the sake of a comparison on a fair basis, we find that our mineral production last year was \$12,113,000, while the mineral production of the United States was \$542,284,000, or a *per capita* excess in the United States over Canada of 3·75, or nearly four times as much as ours. In these circumstances, we cannot flatter ourselves that our mineral production is on a satisfactory basis. Going into particulars, I find that the Americans produced *per capita* 12 times as much iron ore as Canada, 21½ times as much pig iron, 150 times as much lead, 4·05 times as much coal, 16·15 times as much coke, 3·07 times as much building stone, 3·2 times as much brick and tile, 4·25 times as much