

the only basis on which we propose to secure this arrangement. It gives us perfect control of our tariff, and the only concession we would make to the Americans would be the admission of their goods free of duty. That dismisses the charge, so far as the scheme before the House is concerned. But even under commercial union, the Americans would not necessarily have control of our tariff. In the arrangement of that treaty, there would be two parties to be consulted, and each party would possess exactly as much power as the other. One party will be Canada, the other the United States. The smallest iota of difference between the two powers with regard to that treaty will prevent the consummation of it. We must consent to every feature of that tariff. We must have granted to us such terms as we would require with regard to any future changes in that tariff. We would be one of the contracting parties with the same power and weight as the other; and unless that power be conceded, it is not necessary to make a treaty. It is preposterous to say that we will delegate to the United States the power to make our tariff under such an arrangement. In our own hands will be the regulation of every detail of the treaty and of every detail regarding the mode in which changes shall be at any subsequent time brought about.

The next objection is that it will ruin our manufactures. I might say with justice and truth that our manufactures are ruining us. I might say that they are bleeding our producing classes in this country. I might say that they are a great octopus which is sucking the life blood out of all except the small favored ring, and I do not know that I would sympathise very much with these men if they were punished. I do not believe, however, that it would hurt them; and if it would, I do not know that I would sacrifice the interests of the farmer, the lumberman, the fishermen, the miner or the laborer even to save the manufacturer. I would proceed upon the sound old adage, of the greatest good to the greatest number, and if the policy was to benefit a thousand men and only injure ten, I would not feel bound to do any more for the ten than extend them my sympathy. But I do not believe it would injure the manufacturers. I find a remarkable tendency in the United States to expand in manufactures in the newer districts. I find by the census returns from 1871 to 1881, that the increase in manufactures in the Dominion was 40 per cent., and that in Ontario the increase was 38 per cent. in those ten years. I find that in the older manufacturing States, the increase in manufactures, in the ten years from 1870 to 1880, has been as follows:—

Massachusetts.....	14	per cent.
New York.....	37	do
Connecticut.....	15	do
New Jersey.....	50	do
Pennsylvania.....	5	do
Michigan.....	59	do
Illinois.....	101	do
Wisconsin.....	67	do
Minnesota.....	228	do
Iowa.....	52	do
California.....	74	do

In every one of the newer States the proportion of increase has been vastly greater than in the old manufacturing States. The figures showing increase for a decade are as follows:—

1871 to 1881.		
Canada.....	\$38,000,000	40 per cent.
Ontario.....	43,283,000	38
1870 to 1880.		
Massachusetts.....	77,223,000	14
New York.....	295,502,000	37
Connecticut.....	24,632,000	15
New Jersey.....	85,143,000	5
Pennsylvania.....	32,934,000	5
Ohio.....	78,585,000	30
Indiana.....	39,389,000	36
Michigan.....	56,000,000	59
Illinois.....	208,224,000	101
Minnesota.....	52,955,000	228
Iowa.....	24,511,000	52
California.....	49,624,000	74

Mr. CHARLTON.

In some of the principal cities of the west the increase in production of manufactures from 1870 to 1880 is as follows:—

Louisville.....	\$ 35,000,000
Chicago.....	242,000,000
Milwaukee.....	43,000,000
St. Louis.....	114,000,000
San Francisco.....	78,000,000
Birmingham.....	50,000,000

I am not very much alarmed about the manufactures of this country. I do not take any stock in the doctrine of Canadian inferiority. I do not believe in it. I believe that with equal chances we can compete with the Americans. I believe that we have the energy, we have as cheap capital, and cheaper labor, and I see no reason under Heaven why, with the whole market of this continent open to our manufactures, we should not have an equal chance with the Americans. It is certain that there would be a great impetus in certain natural lines. For instance, the production of lumber could not fail to be greatly increased. In the production of planed lumber, the American tariff absolutely prevents our engaging, while if the duty were removed we would find millions of dollars invested in it in this country. In the production of doors and sashes, house trimmings, we are precluded by the American tariff. Yet this is a vast business which we would otherwise naturally, to a great extent, control. In the manufacture of furniture, wooden ware, leather, for which we have special advantages, we would inevitably vastly increase our business. We would increase the manufacture of iron and woollens, and there is one branch where the chances for expansion are limitless, that is the manufacture of paper from pulp. We have the facilities for this branch, in the possession of limitless quantities of the poplar and other woods required, and would naturally supply the continent with this article, the business in which would amount to millions of dollars a year. I have no fear as to the result of free trade on the manufacturing business in this country. Here and there perhaps a little exotic industry, pampered into existence by a high tariff, would be swept away, but as a whole our manufactures would vastly extend their business under the operation of free trade.

Now, some of our friends opposite—for it is not a party issue at present—propose an offset, and this proposition is at least an indication that there is a feeling of unrest in the country. It indicates that there is an acknowledgment of the desirability, if not the necessity of some change in the condition of Canada. That scheme proposed by them is Imperial Federation. I have no doubt that in some respects a closer union of the colonies with England would be advantageous to the colonies, based however upon one absolutely necessary concession upon the part of England, and that is the enactment of discriminatory duties in favor of the colonies. If England will give us the corn laws again; if she will place duties upon food and lumber, wool and raw materials imported from any country besides the colonies, and admit the productions of the colonies free, we would have advantages in the English market very great as compared with other countries, and it might be worthy of our consideration whether we would not go into such an arrangement. But have we any reason to suppose that she will? Have we not every reason to suppose that she will not? Have we not the express declaration of her leaders, not of one but of both parties, that England will never consider for a moment the propriety of levying duties upon the raw materials and the food of the people. She never will, and if she does not, then the scheme has no attraction for us. We would have our burdens increased by this arrangement, we would have an undue and undesirable interference with our autonomy, and it would not be desirable for us to have our affairs settled by the Parliament at Westminster in which we had a small representation of twenty or thirty members. We would never consent to such a thing.