

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Ross, Lisgar.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Carpenter.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. LAURIER. I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Marine if the papers brought down the other day in regard to the Newfoundland question include the whole of the correspondence?

Mr. TUPPER. No. The papers I brought down the other day are the papers on which I based an answer to a question asked across the House, and which I stated would be prepared in advance of the other papers. The other papers are more voluminous than I understood a few days ago they were, but they have been prepared for presentation, and are awaiting the ordinary approval of the authorities before being laid on the Table.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply. He said: In making my financial statement last year, I estimated that the revenue for 1890-91 would amount to \$38,858,701. The revenue which actually accrued fell short of that by \$279,391, and was distributed as follows:—

Customs	\$23,399,300
Excise	6,914,850
Miscellaneous.....	8,265,160
Total.....	\$38,579,310

Comparing these items and total revenue with the result of 1889-90, we find a Customs decrease of \$589,653, an Excise decrease of \$703,268, and a decrease in Miscellaneous of \$27,694. The decrease in Customs is spread over a number of items, which I will read:

Animals	\$ 9,710
Books, periodicals, &c.....	15,420
Breadstuffs.....	151,743
Cement.....	5,079
Clocks and springs.....	10,512
Crapes.....	3,505
Earthenware and china.....	21,009
Fancy goods.....	90,941
Fish and products of.....	5,154
Furs.....	19,515
Glass.....	19,569
Gold and silver and manufactures of....	4,299
Gunpowder and explosives.....	4,058
Gutta percha and India rubber and manufactures of.....	26,448
Iron and steel and manufactures of.....	194,564
Jewellery.....	18,600
Lead and manufactures of.....	8,331
Leather and manufactures of.....	42,856
Musical instruments.....	3,106
Packages.....	16,516
Paper and manufactures of.....	19,029
Pickles.....	24,519
Provisions.....	104,459
Seeds and roots.....	30,398
Silk and manufactures of.....	51,342
Soap.....	4,608
Spirits and wines.....	148,053
Molasses.....	76,212

Sugar candy.....	\$ 2,876
Tin and manufactures of.....	9,213
Varnish.....	7,877
Vegetables.....	14,498
Watches and parts of.....	21,558
Wood and manufactures of.....	59,995
Wool and manufactures of.....	199,251

The following are some of the principal items from which increased Customs duties were received last year, the principal being sugar:—

Ale, beer and porter.....	\$ 5,786
Brass and manufactures of.....	12,070
Bricks and tiles.....	4,313
Carriages.....	4,224
Coal and coke.....	115,627
Copper and manufactures of.....	28,450
Cordage.....	6,114
Drugs, dyes and chemicals.....	24,532
Flax, hemp and jute and manufactures of	4,315
Fruits and nuts, dried.....	11,740
do green.....	21,332
Gloves and mitts.....	13,648
Hats, caps and bonnets.....	66,657
Metal, composition and other.....	4,446
Oils, coal and kerosene and products of..	5,533
Oils, all other.....	43,986
Ships, vessels, and repairs on.....	3,762
Sugar.....	290,744
Tea.....	3,886
Tobacco and manufactures of.....	31,136
All other articles not specified.....	225,982

There was a decrease in the sugar duties over the normal year preceding, 1888-89; and if it had not been for the displacement and disturbance which arose consequent upon the change of sugar duties in the United States and the idea that a corresponding change would be made in our own tariff, there is no doubt the Customs duties derived therefrom would have been far larger than they were, instead of falling, as they did, far short of those of 1888-89. Excise shows a large decrease of \$703,268, but that is more nominal than real. The law which makes it necessary that spirits should be kept two years in tank for aging purposes came into effect the 1st of July, 1890, and a large amount of spirits was withdrawn in anticipation, the duties upon which would have amounted to probably \$500,000. This would have gone naturally, but for that circumstance, into the Excise duties of the year we are considering. In the Miscellaneous a small decrease, as compared with the preceding year, is shown, namely, \$27,694. The total decrease amounts to \$1,320,615. With reference to Excise, the following table shows the course of business for two years:—

TABLE showing the Quantities taken out and the Duties accrued.

	Quantity		1889-90, Duty Ac- crued.	1890-91, Duty Ac- crued.	In- crease or De- crease.
	1889-90, Quantity	1890-91, Quantity	\$	\$	
Spirits.....	3,574,799 Gals.	2,708,841 Gals.	4,617,643	3,544,191	1,073,452
Malt.....	54,974,013 Lbs.	57,909,201 Lbs.	557,021	588,593	+31,572
Cigars.....	98,810,725 No.	101,117,080 No.	593,710	605,017	+11,307
Cigarettes.....	28,990,440 Lbs.	36,066,600 Lbs.	43,508	54,737	+11,229
Tobacco and Snuff	9,802,951	9,688,643	1,850,621	1,869,895	+19,274

This shows that the quantity of spirits taken from bond in 1889-90 amounted to 3,574,799 gallons. In

1890-91 the quantity taken out was 2,708,841 gallons, and the decrease in the accrued duty of 1890-91, as compared with 1889-90, was over \$1,000,000. All the other articles of Excise, malt, cigars, cigarettes, tobacco, and snuff, show an increase over the preceding year. Malt shows an increase of \$31,572 in accrued duties; cigars show an increase of \$11,307 in accrued duties; cigarettes show an increase of \$11,229; and tobacco and snuff an increase of \$19,274 in accrued duties. It might be as well to keep up the table which has been presented for several years in our financial statements as to the *per capita* consumption of liquors and tobacco, as shown by the Excise reports. The following are the figures:—

PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS AND TOBACCO.

—	Spirits.	Beer.	Wine.	Tobacco.
	Gals.	Gals.	Gals.	Lbs.
Average from 1867....	1151	2708	140	2128
do 1889-90..	883	3360	104	2143
do 1890-91..	866	3282	102	2033

When we come to the expenditures of 1890-91, which were estimated at \$36,000,000, we find that the actual expenditure exceeded that amount by \$343,567, giving a total actual expenditure of \$36,343,567. Although the expenditure last year shows an increase of this amount over the estimate, the expenditure itself is \$574,267 less than the expenditure in 1888-89. The chief items in which there was an increase of expenditure, as compared with the preceding year, are as follows:—

Premium, Discount and Exchange.....	\$ 33,285
Sinking Fund.....	50,841
Civil Government.....	25,306
Administration of Justice.....	16,808
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics.....	4,655
Census.....	252,134
Fisheries.....	45,300
Geological Survey.....	8,523
Immigration.....	70,954
Quarantine.....	4,998
Lighthouse and Coast Service.....	26,481
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions	34,802
Miscellaneous.....	7,729
N. W. Territories Government.....	68,545
Ocean and River Service.....	35,231
Penitentiaries.....	3,319
Collection of Revenue—Customs.....	27,061
do Excise.....	15,240
do Post Office.....	87,206
do Public Works.....	10,235
do Railways & Canals.....	143,316
do Weights, Measures and Gas.....	3,655

A large increase took place owing to the census, for which there was an item of \$252,134. The next largest item is in the collection of revenue, Railways and Canals, which shows an increase of \$143,316. The increase in expenditure, therefore, as compared with the preceding year, is almost entirely due to the abnormal and large expenditure incurred in taking the census. The decreases were as follows:—

Interest on Public Debt.....	\$ 72,705
Charges of Management.....	1,625
Indians.....	120,389
Legislation.....	335,701

Mr. FOSTER.

Marine Hospitals.....	\$ 6,562
Militia and Defence.....	7,500
Mounted Police.....	12,114
Pensions.....	3,541
Public Works.....	34,956
Railways and Canals.....	15,106
Culling Timber.....	2,182
Dominion Lands.....	15,091

Decreases took place in the expenditure on the interest on the Public Debt of \$72,705, due to the retirement of stock bearing 6 per cent, 5 per cent and 4 per cent and replaced by money borrowed at about 3½ per cent. In Charges of Management there is a slight decrease of \$1,625. In the care of Indians, there is a large decrease, amounting to \$120,389. In the Mounted Police there is a decrease of \$12,114. As far as these decreases are concerned, they are permanent as regards Mounted Police and Indians and, in the matter of the Public Debt, so far as the principal involved is concerned, while the increases are largely abnormal in their character and are not likely to occur again, the census being likely to be finished during the current year. Summing up, then, we have as a revenue for the past year \$38,579,310, and an expenditure of \$36,343,567, which leaves us with a surplus on Consolidated Fund account of \$2,235,742. If it were not for the item of Capital Expenditures, this surplus would remain in hand for a decrease of the debt, but during the past year there was expended on capital account the following amounts:—

Railways and Canals.....	\$2,502,409
Public Works.....	515,702
Dominion Lands.....	94,847
N. W. Rebellion Losses.....	2,901
	<u>\$3,115,859</u>
Railway Subsidies.....	1,265,705
	<u>\$4,381,564</u>

Comparing this with the previous year, 1889-90, we find that the expenditure then on capital account was \$5,731,354, as against \$4,381,564 in 1890-91, making a saving in favour of the latter year of \$1,349,790. The net result, therefore, of the operation of the year, is that we have provided for the ordinary expenses and services of the country out of the Consolidated Fund, we have laid up in the Sinking Fund, which is of course practically a reduction of the debt, \$1,938,078, we have provided for capital expenditures, including railway subsidies, \$4,381,564, and we have been able to do that with an addition to the debt of only \$275,818. Hon. gentlemen may remember that in 1889, on the occasion of my first Budget speech, I made a forecast as follows: That I thought the time had come for equalizing revenue and expenditure, and that, by the time we entered 1892, we should have reduced the revenue and expenditure to a balance, and from that time on we should have sufficient as a surplus from Consolidated Revenue Fund to pay the ordinary capital expenditure which was necessary for the country from year to year. That forecast has so far been fulfilled, and if it had not been that we took off the duties on raw sugar last year, involving a loss of over \$3,000,000 in that item of revenue alone, we should have been able to come up to the end of 1892 without one dollar of increase of debt since 1889, and with more than half a million of decrease in our permanent debt. It may not be uninteresting to the House to take a review of the four years just past in order to show by a bird's-eye view the financial operations

of the country during that time. This will readily appear from the following table:—

	1887-88.	1888-89.	1889-90.	1890-91.
Expenditure on Consolidated Fund.....	36,718,494	36,017,834	35,994,051	36,343,567
Expenditure on Capital (not including railway subsidies).....	4,437,460	4,420,313	4,053,159	3,115,860
Revenue, Consolidated Fund.....	35,908,463	38,782,870	39,879,925	38,579,310
Surplus or Deficit.....	-810,031	+1,865,035	+3,885,893	+2,235,742
Net debt.....	234,531,358	237,809,041	237,533,211	237,809,040
Increase of net debt.....	7,216,592	2,998,683	3,170	275,818
Net interest paid.....	8,891,288	8,843,539	8,574,570	8,506,908
Rate of interest on gross debt.....	3.45	3.52	3.37	3.35
do do net.....	3.12	3.07	2.90	2.93
Net interest <i>per capita</i> (revised).....	1.90	1.86	1.79	1.76

It will be seen that, during those four years, the expenditure on Consolidated Fund account has kept remarkably even, being on an average about \$36,000,000 each year. On capital account, not including railway subsidies, we expended in 1887-88, \$4,437,460; in 1888-89, \$4,420,313; in 1889-90, \$4,033,159; and in 1890-91, \$3,115,860; the amount for 1890-91 being \$1,321,600 less than was expended in 1887-88, which again is in the proper direction. The revenue, also, has been buoyant, rising from \$36,908,463 in 1887-88 to \$38,579,310 in 1890-91. There was one deficit incurred contrary to the convictions and the traditions of the party, which occurred in 1887-88, but which was due to abnormal conditions and amounted to \$810,031; but the subsequent years showed a surplus of \$1,865,035 in 1888-89, \$3,885,893 in 1889-90, and \$2,235,742 in 1890-91. The net debt has remained at about the same figure, and is now \$237,809,030. The net debt increase in the last two years has been only \$275,818. The net interest paid has decreased from 1887-88, having been \$8,891,288 in that year, \$8,843,539 in 1888-89, \$8,574,570 in 1889-90 and \$8,506,908 in 1890-91. That is to say, in the four years the net interest paid has decreased by about \$400,000. The rate of interest on the gross debt has also decreased continuously as well as on the net debt, and while it stood at 3.45 on the gross debt in 1887-88, it is now only 3.35, while the interest on the net debt has decreased from 3.12 in the first year to 2.93 in the last year. The net interest *per capita* required to carry the debt according to the revision consequent upon the census statement, was \$1.90 in 1887-88 and \$1.76 in 1890-91. This, in brief, shows the operation

Mr. FOSTER.

of the finances of the country during the last four years, and I have no hesitation in presenting it to the House and to the country as a conservative statement full of hope and promise as to the ability and the capacity of this country, in the first place to keep its expenses fairly within reasonable limits, and at the same time to carry on without undue stint the public and necessary services of the country. Coming now to 1891-92, the current year, the receipts up to the 20th March were \$25,459,000. From the 20th March, 1890, to the end of the last fiscal year the receipts were \$11,396,000. But of course there have been changes which will necessitate my making a different estimate for the time between the 20th March, 1892, and the end of this fiscal year. The expected increase in Excise for the remaining four months, or about that time, as compared with the like period of last year, is estimated at \$350,000, and the expected decrease in sugar duties for that time is estimated at \$550,000. So, provided that the trade of the country goes on upon about the same basis as last year, and making an allowance for these two items, we may expect for the remainder of the term from the 20th March to the 1st July, \$11,196,000 of revenue. That, added to what has accrued up to the 20th March, will give for the current year an estimated revenue of \$36,655,000, divided probably as follows:—Customs, \$20,500,000; Excise, \$7,900,000; Miscellaneous, \$8,265,000. On that basis of calculation the revenue from Customs paid by the people of the country this year will be, in round numbers, \$3,000,000 less than that paid last year, which was about the amount of actual taxation taken off in the repeal of the duties of raw sugar. The Excise will net, probably, about \$1,000,000 more than the past year. The Miscellaneous I have estimated at about the same. Coming to the expenditure for 1891-92, up to the 20th March we have expended \$23,206,000, and I estimate for expenditure up to the end of June, \$13,450,000, which will make a total estimated expenditure for the current year of \$36,650,000, which is just about the same as my estimate of revenue, leaving a small balance to the good, if we come out upon that basis. That is, the House is to understand that under present conditions of tariff and revenue, as long as they remain, we must not expect much surplus. We may expect an average income of about \$36,500,000. We must cut our garments according to our cloth, and keep our expenditure within that amount. The estimate for 1892-93 is as follows:—Customs, \$20,500,000; Excise, \$8,000,000; Miscellaneous, \$8,000,000, making in all \$36,500,000. So much with reference to that. Last year, as the House already knows, temporary loans had to be incurred to the amount of \$7,786,666. These were, of course, made for the purpose of meeting redemption of debt, as last year the total addition to the net debt was only some \$3,000. We have running now, as the House was informed a few days ago, \$9,753,333 in temporary loans. I may take a moment to explain as to the items of redemption which made these loans necessary. First, there has been the drain upon the savings banks of the country, owing to the change of interest from 4 per cent to 3½ per cent, and perhaps to other causes more general in their nature. In 1889-90, there was withdrawn from the savings banks of the country \$1,943,892 more than the deposits, plus the accrued interest for the year. In 1890-91, the sum

thus withdrawn was \$1,612,438, a reduction of about \$300,000; and I estimate that for the current year there will be nothing withdrawn in excess of the deposits, plus the accrued interest, but that rather, from the indications of the last eight months, we will have a sum to the good, striking a balance between these two items. These, however, make a sum of \$3,500,000 which was practically a redemption of debt, and had to be met and was met out of these temporary loans. For redemption of debt proper, we redeemed in 1889-90, \$3,577,348; in 1890-91, \$1,905,964; in 1891-92, \$1,937,795; in 1892-93, \$2,178,960 will be redeemed, making a total amount of \$9,600,067 for redemption of debt to be met out of temporary loans. Then the capital expenditure, the increase of debt for the two preceding years, the net increase of debt for the current year and the next year, have to be met as well: so that in addition to the \$9,753,333, which is at present running as a temporary loan, probably some \$5,000,000 will have to be provided either by temporary or by permanent loan. As I mentioned to my hon. friend who questioned me on this point the other day, whether these temporary loans shall be continued as they are, or as they can best be continued, or whether it will be thought advisable to go upon the market for a permanent loan to meet and wipe out all these temporary loans, will be dependent upon the indications of the money market, and the present is not a time at which I can definitely say what these indications will advise. To show that whatever may have been the reduction in the Government savings banks in 1889-90 and 1890-91, it was not due to a diminution in the savings and deposits of the people, I have here a table which I think will give satisfaction to the House. This shows the total:

DEPOSITS IN BANKS.

	May 31, '90	May 31, '91	Feb. 20, '92
	\$	\$	\$
In P.O. Savings Banks	21,357,554	21,130,429	21,686,074
In Dom. Savings Banks	18,488,200	17,114,889	16,929,825
In Charter'd Banks payable on demand	51,440,101	56,522,473	60,029,923
In Charter'd Banks payable after notice or on a fixed day	74,629,147	84,679,400	93,394,227
City and District Savings Bank, and Caisse d' Economie	10,778,164	10,994,546	11,928,669
Totals	176,703,253	190,441,739	203,968,719

This tells us that whereas the year ending May 31, 1891, witnessed a decrease of over \$1,600,000 in deposits in the Government banks the 8 months of the current year show an increase of nearly \$400,000 in these deposits, while the total increase in all banks is, for the 8 months, \$13,526,980, and for the 20 months \$27,265,461. Whatever course may be adopted as to these temporary loans it is satisfactory to know that there are indications from the records of the past two years of some trial and difficulty, that in the money markets at home the credit of Canada stands well. First, our stocks and securities, while participating in the general fall which took place a year or so ago, owing to well-known causes, have speedily recovered and maintained themselves since in advance of the securities and stocks of every other colonial

market. I think it is not amiss for me, at this point, to take notice of what I consider a somewhat remarkable, as it is, I am happy to say, an unprecedented, circumstance, with reference to our position and standing in the old country. Hon. gentlemen know well on this side of the House that during the last three or four years we have had to meet in the United States of America malign influences emanating from certain persons in Canada, pointing out to those who are not very friendly to us on that side of the line, the way in which Canada could be the most effectually stricken and in what interests she might be most especially hurt. And those intimations, sent often direct, sent often through agents, and influential agents, sent quite as often in the published speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, have had their effect, and it has happened that in the legislation which has supervened Canada has been hit at exactly those points pointed out in the way I have mentioned. But, Sir, it had not been known previously that the scene of operations was to be transferred from this country and carried to the mother country, where the credit and reputation of Canada are of much importance to us, and contribute greatly to our prestige and our prosperity. But, Sir, it has so been determined and the first attack has been delivered. The time of the attack was a peculiarly opportune one for an enemy to have winged his arrow to a vital point in Canadian reputation and Canadian credit. It was a time when the money market in Great Britain was peculiarly sensitive. It had for two years been sustaining the strain of losses and liquidations in South America and of liquidations at home, and was agitated by the possibilities and premonitions of financial hardship, and perhaps financial disaster in different parts of Europe. It was a time when criticism of colonial finance was much the fashion in Great Britain, and was somewhat unfavourable, owing to the late attempts which have been made, not always successfully, by the Australian colonies to float loans on the money market, and which had in most cases resulted unfavourably to themselves. It was a time when, as I have stated, Canada herself had temporary loans running, amounting to \$10,000,000, which had to be continued or renewed in one form or another. It was a time when many meritorious enterprises were upon the London market, which, if they could be realized, would tend to the development of the resources of Canada in a material degree. It was a time, too, when owing to the fine and abundant harvest of last year emigrants from the various centres of Great Britain were being led to look to Canada, and to our North-West particularly, as a future home for themselves and their families. It was a time, when a friend of Canada, if he had nothing good to say, would have held his peace, or if he could have presented one truth to have buoyed up and sustained the position of Canada, would have thought it his duty to do so. It was a time when an enemy would have dipped his arrow in poison and winged it as straight as he could to the vital part of Canadian credit and reputation in the old country. He was wickedly wise too in his choice of the instrument through which to make his attack. He chose a financial paper, one of the first in Great Britain which circulates among monied men, and through its utterances and representations has great influence and great weight in determining the mind of monied men towards any

country or enterprise, and which is studied as well by influential factors and motors in the emigration from that country to this. Sir, I hold in my hand the document which, at this particular time and by this particular vehicle, has been not only sent broadcast in the *Economist* through Great Britain to do its work, but has actually been printed, probably by the writer himself—if not by him by one who was a no greater friend to Canada—and as a campaign document has been spread through Great Britain from one end to the other. What are the assertions contained in this document? They are assertions not new to us here, assertions stated over and over again from almost every platform in the country and on the floor of this House year after year, and exposed as often as they were uttered; but which going to the British public and the British people had far different weight attached to them from the name and position of the writer and from the fact that the phases of Canadian party politics and the facts relating thereto are not studied and are not well understood, as indeed they could scarcely be, by the people in Great Britain. I suppose it is known to whom I refer, the gentleman sits opposite to me to-day, he was Finance Minister during the Liberal regime, he is to-day the actual financial leader of his party, if not the potent leader of his party, he is the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). His statements, which may be read by any hon. member who chooses to do so, are familiar and well known, but I have arranged just half-a-dozen in a line of crescendo or climax, keeping the worst to the last. He declares in that document that during thirteen years Canada has trebled her taxation. This is not true. He declares there exists a tremendous exodus and very great depreciation in farm lands. That is an exaggeration, and what there is true in it is made all the more mischievous because he puts no facts of comparison along with the statement he makes. He declares there has been an immense increase in the aggregate debt of this country. The immense increase consists in this—he is speaking of federal matters, I suppose, and he means federal indebtedness—that in 1878 the amount per head paid for the federal indebtedness was \$1.58, whilst in 1891 it was \$1.76, an immense increase of just 18 cents per head during the period from 1878 to 1891. That document states that the great mass of the people, notably the farmers of Canada, are distinctly poorer than twelve years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a fine statement to be made by the hon. gentleman and spread broadcast throughout Great Britain, from which we get the greater part, I may say the better part, of the immigration which comes to this country. He declares the census shows that Canada lost in the last ten years 1,500,000 of people. The census shows no such thing; but such a slight misrepresentation as that causes no scruples with the hon. gentleman, he makes his statement all the same. He declares that the agriculturists of this country have been simply bled white and that \$60,000,000 are taken annually out of the pockets of the people for federal taxation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And more.

Mr. FOSTER. That, in connection with the hon. gentleman's statement that in thirteen years Canada has trebled her taxation, is probably the greatest of all the many great exaggerations of which the hon. gentleman, during the last five

Mr. FOSTER.

years, has been guilty. In 1878 the taxation of the country for revenue purposes was \$17,841,938, or \$4.37 per head. In 1891 it was \$30,214,150, or \$6 per head. The increase in taxation as to amount has therefore been but 70 per cent, and as to relative incidence but 37 per cent, instead of 200 per cent. In no country in the world do farmers pay less taxes than in Canada. He declares that bribery is a pure matter of business routine in Canada. The hon. gentleman may find something in his own experience to justify this statement; I would not contradict that, but if he means that assertion to apply to the Canadian Government, as at present constituted, or as it has been constituted since 1878, I give it my emphatic denial. He affirmed, Sir, that public life in Canada is disgraced by an intolerable and organized corruption, unknown to the people of England since the days of Walpole, or Charles the Second, and he winds up by declaring that it is utterly impossible for Canada to prosper under present conditions; that, "if there is no change, Confederation must perish, rotten before it had time to become half ripe, as a result of the vice and the folly with which its affairs have been administered." That, Sir, is the hon. gentleman's contribution. A more unfounded, a more unjustifiable and a more mischievous attempt to ruin the reputation and credit of his country in another land is, happily, not to be found in the annals of modern political history. Now, I say that the hon. gentleman can have but one motive in penning that letter and publishing it as he has published it. His presumed motive for taking his case at all before the British public, was, that he might explain to the British public what he meant by this policy which for the last five years he has been endeavouring to thrust upon the people of Canada, and which was as intolerable to the thinking British public as it was to the thinking Canadian public. That, Sir, might have been a good and valid excuse for the hon. gentleman to have explained his policy and defended it before the British public, but it was no excuse for him taking up more than half of his letter in this vilification and unwarranted abuse of the people, the politics, the reputation and the credit of Canada. He could have but one motive, and that motive was to transfer the partisan operations carried on during the last five years in fruitless fields comparatively upon this side, to the other side of the water, from which we draw our sympathy, where we look for large capital to develop this country, and where the credit and reputation of Canada count as a great factor in our future progress and development. These same misrepresentations the hon. gentleman has brought forth before the electorate of Canada time and again for the last five or six years. He has given them utterance on almost every hustings in the country, and wherever he has uttered them, almost without fail in these latter days, the people have repudiated him. Now, the hon. gentleman, foiled, disappointed and balked in his programme of veiled annexation in Canada—I quote the words, and if not the words the exact meaning of the gentleman whom he owned as leader for six or seven years in this House—foiled and balked and disappointed in that, he has nothing better to do than to transfer his base of operations to the mother country and give there one final stab as strong as he can at the credit, the reputation and the vitality of his native country. I thought it my duty to call the attention of the House and

the country to this matter. I brand the action of the hon. gentleman as unprecedented, as unjustifiable, as uncalled for, and as most unpatriotic; but which, from a party point of view, I present to hon. gentlemen opposite with this single remark: That so long as they retain their affiliation in politics with a gentleman who adopts that method of warfare, just so long they will not have to seek far and wide for reasons why they are repudiated by the Canadian people and refused the reins of political power. They will find the explanations close at home in such actions as those I have noted.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Probably they will get a recount.

Mr. FOSTER. It would take a great many recounts to have the hon. gentleman who interrupts me straightened up. I pass from that little episode to a more pleasing subject for the House in general, and one which will prove, I am sure, a complete refutation of the misrepresentations I have just noticed, and I will enquire for a few moments as to the conditions of trade as developed by the operation of the past and of the current year so far as it has gone. I do this, largely because the assertion is very frequently made inside this House and out of it, that the trade of Canada is actually diminishing, and that since the operations of the McKinley Bill and the making of treaties consequent upon that legislation, Canadian trade is being hampered and Canada as a country is becoming isolated and restricted in her area of business transactions. Well, Sir, if we take the aggregate trade of last year we will find that it remained at about the same figure as that of the preceding year, which, however, we must not forget was in advance of about \$14,000,000 upon the year preceding that. The imports, however, are nearly \$2,000,000 less than in 1890, caused mainly by larger productions for our own home market as a result of tariff legislation, and as a result of the development of our manufacturing industries. Take, for instance, as a matter of tariff legislation. We find that there is a decrease, in round numbers, of \$800,000 in the importations of pork and pork products from the United States in 1891, as compared with 1890. That does not mean that our people have consumed or produced less pork products, but it means that the pork products which before, under lower tariff, came in from the United States of America and displaced or supplied the demand for our own products, have been kept out to that extent; and that this demand is now supplied by home production to the benefit of the consumer and producer as well. The following table will make this clear:—

IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES INTO CANADA.

	1890.	1891.	Decrease.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Bacon, hams and shoulders	4,353,653	2,570,412	1,783,241
Beef	6,445,105	2,715,101	3,730,004
Mutton	246,363	6,388	239,975
Pork	17,185,794	11,116,948	6,068,846
Lard	4,881,786	991,655	3,890,131
	33,112,701	17,400,504	15,712,197
Value	\$1,734,225	\$973,312	\$760,913

The total exports, however, of this past year amounting to \$98,417,296 show an increase of \$1,668,147 over 1890; so that, while the imports have decreased for the causes I have mentioned, our exports show a gratifying extension, especially when you find that compared with the exports of the preceding year of 1889 they exceed these by the large sum of \$9,228,129. An increase of nearly \$10,000,000 in exports in two years during the very period of this threatened and much-talked of legislation which was to have hindered and restricted us, is very gratifying to anyone who looks upon the matter from a fair and reasonable standpoint. The export of the last year is the largest of any year since Confederation, with the exception of 1882. It is nearly \$14,000,000 more than the average yearly export since Confederation, and \$17,700,000 more than the average annual export during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite. As further confirmation of the favourable trend discernible in this, I may mention this fact to the House: That although the exports last year reached that high water mark and were \$10,000,000 above the exports of 1889, yet in the eight months of the current year the exports are higher than the exports of the eight months corresponding of last year by about \$10,000,000. This means that if the proportionate increase holds till the end of the year, the exports for 1891-92 will be about \$13,000,000 or \$14,000,000 greater than the exports of last year, which were \$10,000,000 more than the exports of 1889. It is a circumstance which I have noted, and which may be interesting in itself, that there is scarcely a dollar's difference between the exports of the eight months of the current year which I have mentioned and those of the twelve months of the last year that my hon. friend was Finance Minister in the Government of Mr. Mackenzie. This statement is immensely strengthened, and will be by that much the more reassuring to the country, by the reflection that since 1873 the value of articles of export and import has decreased by about one-third, and that to find the comparative volume of trade now as compared with that date you must add fully one-third to the figures of the present trade. This, Sir, would make the trade of 1891 about \$200,000,000 on the basis of the values of 1873 as compared with the trade of the latter year. Our total trade has increased with the United States, Germany, Spain, Italy, Newfoundland, the West Indies, China and Japan. It has decreased slightly with Great Britain, France, Portugal, Holland, Belgium, South America and Switzerland. Our export trade, however, has increased largely, that with Great Britain being \$11,000,000 in excess of 1889, and that with the West Indies having increased in the same time by about \$500,000. Our exports to the United States, as compared with those of 1889, show a decrease of \$2,400,000. I have a table here which I will read, simply to show the trend of trade within the last few years, and to give us hope and confidence that neither the McKinley Bill nor any other of a like nature necessarily bars the current of Canada's export trade or the current of its general business. Comparing 1888 with 1891, our exports of animals and their products to the United States fell from \$7,595,000 to \$4,316,000, a decrease of 43 per cent, whereas the exports of the same products to Great Britain rose from \$16,500,000 in 1888 to \$21,000,000 in 1891, an increase of 27 per cent. The exports of agricultural products to the United States fell from \$10,000,000 in 1888 to \$7,000,000 in 1891, a de-

crease of 30 per cent, while those sent to England rose from \$4,292,000 in 1888 to \$5,254,000 in 1891, an increase of 22 per cent. If you take the total exports in 1888 and compare them with those of 1891, there was a decrease of 3½ per cent in those sent to the United States and an increase of 22 per cent in those sent to England.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are these the products of Canada alone, or the total exports?

Mr. FOSTER. These are the home productions of Canada alone. There is another indication contradictory of this theory or assertion that trade is stagnant in Canada. It is found in the record of the railways and shipping of Canada, as shown in the following table:—

RAILWAYS IN CANADA.

Year.	Miles Operated.	Train Mileage.	Number Passengers.	Tons Freight.	Earnings.
1875	4,826	17,680,168	5,190,416	5,670,836	19,470,539
1880	6,891	22,427,449	6,462,948	9,938,858	23,561,447
1889	12,628	38,819,380	12,151,051	17,928,626	42,149,615
1890	13,256	41,849,329	12,821,262	20,787,469	46,843,826
1891	14,007	43,334,891	13,164,420	21,727,025	48,139,980
Increase, 1891 over 1875...		145 p. c.	153 p. c.	283 p. c.	147 p. c.

SHIPPING IN CANADA.

Year.	Tonnage of Vessels in and out, exclusive of Coasting.	Tonnage of Vessels in and out, Coasting.
1879	11,646,812	12,066,683
1889	16,054,221	19,834,977
1890	18,446,100	22,797,115
1891	18,803,648	24,986,130
Increase, 1891 over 1879...	61 p. c.	107 p. c.

In 1875 we had 4,826 miles in operation; in 1891 we had 14,007 miles in operation. The train mileage in the same time rose from 17,680,168 miles to 43,334,891 miles, an increase of 145 per cent. The passengers increased from 5,190,416 to 13,164,420, an increase of 153 per cent. The freight increased from 5,670,836 tons to 21,727,025 tons, an increase of 283 per cent. The earnings increased from \$19,470,539 to \$48,139,980, an increase of 147 per cent. These figures effectually demonstrate the absurdity of the contention that the trade of Canada is not on a constant and progressive increase.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The railways are not controlled by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very wise and sapient remark, and I earnestly commend it to all my hon. friends on this side of the House. I hope they will not be overcome by its sapiency.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I beg pardon. The Inter-colonial Railway is controlled by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Taking also the shipping, which is another branch of our carrying trade, we find that in 1879 the tonnage of vessels in and out, sea-going and inland, exclusive of coasting vessels, rose from 11,646,812 tons in 1879 to 18,803,648 in

Mr. FOSTER.

1891, an increase of 61 per cent. The tonnage of coasting vessels in and out rose from 12,066,683 tons in 1879 to 24,986,130 tons in 1891, an increase of 107 per cent. These, too, are conclusive indications of the business and trade activity and development of this country. So that, looking at these indications of the increase of both our foreign and interprovincial trade, the conclusion is forced upon us that there has been a great and progressive increase in the general trade and commerce of Canada. In passing, I wish to speak for a moment of the different large steamship services of Canada—not by way of going exhaustively at all into the operations of the past year, but merely to say that in the Pacific coast and the West Indies steamship lines, there has been a constant and gratifying increase, both in the passengers carried and in the freight delivered. The steamship service to the West Indies, especially during this last year, appears to have given excellent satisfaction, and to have been a principal factor in developing a largely increased trade between our country and those different islands. With reference to the Atlantic fast steamship service, during the past year tenders were again called for. In answer to our calls but two tenders were received, both of which were, in the opinion of the Government, beyond what could reasonably be expended by this country for a fast Atlantic service: so that, though the policy of the Government has not changed, the circumstances have made it impossible for us as yet to establish that service. I may state, also, that in accordance with my intimation given in the House last year on an item in the Estimates, I have this year made a beginning in the way of establishing corresponding commercial agencies in different ports and countries, somewhat on the consular plan, without, of course, diplomatic standing or diplomatic responsibility. At the present time we have as commercial agents in Paris, in Great Britain, in the principal centres of the West Indian Islands, gentlemen whose services are enlisted for the purpose of giving all possible information by correspondence and by reports, to be sent to the department and to be published in bulletin form, as to the opportunities that exist for trade and commerce between those different countries and Canada: and I have no doubt that this service will develop gradually into one of great practical benefit to the mercantile classes of our own country and the different countries with which we establish trade relations. The feature of the year outside of Canada has been the wide arrangement of commercial tariffs, and the changed principle upon which commercial intercourse between different countries is regulated. Within the last few months we have had France moving to do away with every treaty in which a most-favoured-nation clause was found, giving notice as to all such which were about to expire, and denouncing them at the period of expiry; and by the 1st of July, 1892, every treaty, with one exception, which runs for another year in addition, that France had with other countries, embodying the most-favoured-nation clause and carrying the obligations of that clause, will have been done away with. The French Government has legislated in the line of a double tariff;—a minimum tariff, sufficient, in its opinion, to protect French industries, for it is constructed upon the protective basis

and which shall be granted to those countries who give like or compensating concessions to France, and a general tariff which is applicable to all other countries. Trade arrangements, based upon the minimum tariff, are subject to denouncement or change, at once or upon a year's notice, so that none of the disturbing and sometimes embarrassing complications which attach to the most-favoured-nation clause will, after the 1st of July next, be in the way of the commerce of France with other countries. Consequent upon this has followed a rearrangement among other European countries, Prussia, Austro-Hungary, Switzerland and Italy making a treaty among themselves, by which certain products are mutually charged a lower rate of duties, thus stimulating, so far as they could in that direction, trade among those four great countries. Then we have seen the United States of America, by virtue of the third clause of the McKinley Act, entering into a series of treaties with other countries. Up to the present time the following have been promulgated:—with Brazil, with Spain for Cuba and Porto Rico, with the British West Indies, with the Dominican Republic, with Salvador, Germany, France and Nicaragua, giving these countries in exchange for certain reductions and the placing of certain articles upon the free list, the benefit of allowing hides, coffee, sugar and molasses to come into the United States free of duty. In all these changes, what has been the result, so far as Canadian interests and trade are concerned? In the first place, I may say that with reference to France, we stand in about the same position as we did before. We had before to pay a surtax, over and above the rate charged Great Britain, on our colonial produce exported to that country. To-day we are under the operations of the general tariff. With reference to the treaty which has been arranged between Prussia, Austro-Hungary, Italy and Switzerland, whatever benefits accrue from it by the way of lessening duties, accrue to Canada as well by virtue of the most-favoured-nation clause in treaties with Germany and Austro-Hungary, so that the benefits of lessened duties upon certain articles under their lately arranged treaty inure as well to the products of Canada coming under the same schedule. With reference to the treaties which have been made by the United States, as far as Cuba and Porto Rico are concerned, we have the advantage of the most-favoured-nation treatment until the 1st of July of this year. Negotiations are now in progress with a view of having continued to us the same favourable terms; and there is nothing, so far as the tariff of our country is concerned, in its treatment of products of Cuba and Porto Rico which should induce them to give any better terms to the United States of America than to Canada, as we allow their products in, on the whole, on a more favoured basis than even the United States. With regard to the British West Indies, no discrimination was—I will not say allowed—but hinted at in the arrangement of the treaty between them and the United States of America; and I think we owe to the British West India Islands this acknowledgment of their fair and manly and brotherly spirit, that in making a treaty which they considered to be of very great benefit to themselves, and in which considerable pressure was brought to induce them to give better treatment to the goods of the United States than to Canadian and British goods, they adhered to the Colonial and Imperial system of treating sister

colonies and the mother country on the same basis as they treat others. With reference to the Dominican Republic, as I have stated, although our trade with the Republic is not very large, we happen to have the benefit of the most-favoured-nation clause. So that Brazil is the only country outside of those I have mentioned in which our products, for the time being, in certain lines, are placed at a disadvantage as compared with those of the United States, and I may say that negotiations are now in progress, which I hope will eventuate in our products being placed on the same footing as those of the United States in the markets of Brazil. Naturally, this review of treaty arrangements and their results upon Canada, leads up to the conference which took place not long since in Washington between delegates of the Canadian Government and representatives of the Cabinet of the United States, with reference to trade relations. The House is seized of the correspondence and the facts with reference to the steps which brought about the ultimate and completed conference; and on the 10th of February of this year, by appointment of the Secretary of State, a delegation from the Canadian Government went to Washington and met the Secretary of State in conference. I may say this, and I think it is nothing more than right to say it, that Mr. Blaine met us with the greatest kindness and courtesy. Although not in the enjoyment of robust health, and although he was in the midst of the arduous duties of a session of Congress, in the midst of diplomatic correspondence of a weighty and grave character, he gave up his time to the delegation from Canada and for five successive days met them in full and frank and prolonged conference upon the various points treated of between the two. I will say nothing as regards the other points discussed, which have already been more or less fully laid before Parliament, but with reference to the discussion of the trade question I think it my duty to make Parliament acquainted with what took place and the results therefrom. In conference with Mr. Blaine, the Canadian delegation proposed, as a basis for negotiation, the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, with such modifications and extensions as the changed condition of both countries might render necessary and desirable, and pressed the conclusion of a treaty upon that basis. They were met with the reply from Mr. Blaine that a proposal looking to a treaty based upon natural products alone had not in it the essential elements of reciprocity, so far as the United States are concerned, and consequently they were unable to entertain it. He raised the question, as did also General Foster, who was his coadjutor in the conference, as to whether we were prepared to make a proposal which would go wider than natural products, and take in and include a general reciprocity in manufactured articles as well. When that point came up, the Canadian delegation immediately raised the question and discussed it fully and freely with Mr. Blaine as to what would be the necessary conditions of such a reciprocity. Did it mean that we were to give United States products and manufactures preferential treatment in our country and discriminate against like articles from Great Britain and from other parts of the world? and the reply came, after a full discussion of the matter, that a reciprocity treaty would have no compensating advantages to the United States of America unless they were

given preferential treatment in our markets, especially against Great Britain, which was their chief competitor in nearly every line of manufactured goods, that under any scheme of reciprocity which could be looked upon favourably by them, the United States would expect to compete with Canadian manufactures in Canadian markets on even terms, but with no others. Well, when that point was reached, discussion took place as to the difficulties to be met by Canada in subscribing to a treaty of that kind, and they were fully and frankly laid before Mr. Blaine. They were, in brief, these: that in going into a treaty of that kind we should stand to lose what we were less able to lose than the United States of America, a considerable proportion of our revenue: first, the eight millions or so which we collected upon the products of the United States that came into Canada; and, secondly, the diminution, whatever it might be, which would result in the imports from the outside world owing to the competition and entrance of United States goods free of duty into our country. Mr. Blaine raised the question whether we had not other methods of taxation. We explained that we had methods of taxation by internal revenue as they themselves had, upon which he remarked that it would be necessary in a treaty of this kind that these inland revenue duties on liquors and tobaccos should be equalized; and that immediately brought up the point that, if they were equalized and if the United States were not willing to level up to our rates, Canada would stand to lose a large amount of revenue in excise duties, inasmuch as our rates are much higher than those of the United States. We also pointed out the grave difficulty which met us in discriminating against the goods of Great Britain with whom, as a colony, we had close and intimate relations, and the repugnance felt against drawing a cordon about ourselves against the world with the exception of the United States. At this point another question came up. Suppose that Canada were willing to discriminate against the goods of the outside world and of Great Britain on this proposed basis of a treaty, who should fix the discrimination and what should be the measure of that discrimination? And as an illustration the article of wool and of woollens was instanced, in which the duties on the raw material vary in both countries as well as do the duties on the manufactured goods. Mr. Blaine admitted at once that this was a vital point, that the United States had its policy of protection, of large protection for both wools and woollen goods, and that unless this vital point were guarded there would be no security to the United States on the one hand against smuggling along a line 3,000 miles in extent, and no security, on the other hand, for the permanence and preservation of the policy of protection which they, up to this time, had maintained, and which they proposed to maintain, and that he saw no way out of the difficulty unless the tariff of Canada were made uniform with that of the United States. Well, Sir, this question passed on in discussion until we had pretty well exhausted the subject, when the Canadian delegates, after having presented these difficulties and canvassed them fairly and thoroughly, said to Mr. Blaine: These are our difficulties; you acknowledge them. Now, you have had large experience in framing reciprocity treaties and have had much to do in

Mr. FOSTER.

the study and arrangements of reciprocal matters: we lay these points before you and we ask whether or not, out of your experience, you cannot see your way to propose a modification of this basis in order that we may diminish, at least to some extent, the difficulties we are under as to loss of revenue, as to discrimination, and as to a uniform tariff; and, after discussion of some time, we received an answer from Mr. Blaine, that while he acknowledged our difficulties, he was clear in his own mind that no other arrangement would be satisfactory to the United States of America, that their manufactures must have preferential treatment, including, of course, discrimination against foreign countries and especially against Great Britain, that there must be a uniform tariff, and that that tariff must be practically the tariff of the United States of America. With this remark, we passed on to other points in discussion and we did not thereafter recur to the trade question. This is, in brief, a fair and candid account of what took place at the conference. I think it is only necessary for me to put in brief the results, and they are simply these: that so long as the present party and the present policy is maintained in the United States, in one branch or the other of the Legislature or in the Executive, we cannot hope for any treaty with the United States, except upon these lines, viz., a treaty which will take in both natural products and manufactured goods: a treaty unlimited in its scope, of which the basis is a preferential treatment in our market with discrimination especially against Great Britain and against other countries: a treaty that must be accompanied by a uniform tariff, and this tariff equalized with that of the United States of America. These are in brief the results which have been arrived at. During years of discussion from the time the old reciprocity treaty was denounced in 1865 to the present time, there have been various ideas put forward, there have been various plans submitted, there have been assertions and counter assertions of what could be done, there have been several proposals made, but up to this date we have been unable to get any one of our proposals adopted by the United States, or to get one counter proposal from them. Now the matter is settled. It is settled in point of clearness and definiteness. I, for my own part, regret that it is settled as it is, and still I am glad that it is settled at all. I regret that no *mollus* can be found by which profitable trade relations could be established between these two countries, without our being called upon to sacrifice too much of Canadian interests and too much of Canadian nationality. I am glad, however, that from this time forward there need be no lack of definiteness, for all parties and all interests in Canada may now know exactly the basis upon which a treaty can be obtained or cannot be obtained.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister whether the deputation at Washington made any report to His Excellency or to their colleagues, on their return, that can be laid before Parliament? I think, Sir, it is a very unusual thing to enter into such a discussion on this occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is the unusual feature on this occasion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman should not rise and interrupt me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Bothwell is rising to a point of order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the rule is, that when a matter of this sort is being discussed, there shall be some official report laid upon the Table of the House as a basis for discussion. The hon. gentleman has referred to negotiations that have taken place, and no report whatever of those negotiations has been laid before Parliament. In the case of a British Minister residing abroad, the practice is for him to make a report of the interview, that report is sent to the Foreign Secretary and is brought down to Parliament. Now, Sir, if the Government adopt the usual course, instead of sending an agent to select certain members of the Government to go themselves, it is the business of those members of the Government to report to the executive head of the Government, and it is the right of Parliament to have that report laid before them. Now, there is no such report whatever before us. We have no means of judging of the statements made by the hon. gentleman except what he says in the speech he is addressing to the House. I say that it is a highly irregular proceeding, and before the hon. gentleman undertook to make such a statement to the House he ought to have made a report to His Excellency or to his colleagues, and that report should be officially before the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has declared that he is speaking on a question of order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I submit whether the hon. gentleman has not completely refuted his own statement by the fact that when he rose the first thing he did was to ask a question of the Minister of Finance-----

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So I did.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON--upon which to base a point of order, and he got no reply to that question. Now, Sir, I submit to you whether there is any rule, any practice, any authority of any description whatever, which restricts a Minister of the Crown from stating that which has transpired on a mission on which he has been sent by competent authority. There is nothing of the kind. I submit, in the usages of Parliament; there is absolutely nothing of the kind in diplomatic usage, or the practice which prevails between Ministers and the Executive. If a Minister of the Crown makes a statement that is not authorized by His Excellency to be made, or which has not been communicated to him--if it should have been communicated to him--that is a matter of responsibility between the Minister and the head of the Executive. But it is the right and privilege of every member, whether he be a Minister of the Crown or a private member of the House, to give to the House that information on public questions which he possesses, whether anybody else has had it communicated to him or not.

Mr. LAURIER. The question put by my hon. friend to the Minister of Finance has not been answered, unless he means to say that he is now making, in his speech, a report of the negotiations which took place at Washington. I submit that if the Minister

wanted to refer in his speech on this occasion to the facts which he is now disclosing, he should have first laid them before the House in the form of a Message.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand the matter, I think the statement made by the Minister of Finance was perfectly in order. I know of no more opportune time than the delivery of the Budget, to deal with these questions with which the Minister of Finance is dealing. He is making statements as to the result of trade negotiations between this Government and the Government of the United States, and I know of no rule of Parliament that would prevent him from making those statements.

Mr. FOSTER. I thank the hon. member for Bothwell for two things: one, for giving me even so short a period of rest; and the other, for his very full indication of his own disturbed feelings at this time. Generally the hon. member for Bothwell is thirsting for information, but to-day he seems to be so full that he does not require further information. We are never too old to learn, as the saying goes, but I am forced to conclude now that my hon. friend is either too old to learn, or does not wish to learn any more. I was proceeding to remind the House, when I was interrupted, that we have now acquired a definite statement as to the real basis upon which a treaty with the United States of America was possible. I was going on to say that I was glad that it was settled, although I regretted that it was settled in that way. For several years the commerce of this country, the business of the country, and the prosperity of the country, have been affected by an agitation which contemplated a very grave change in the commercial and other conditions of Canada. An agitation was set on foot which promised certain things, and held out in roseate language a certain prospect as the result of what could be accomplished, and this continual agitation, and placing before the people the idea of great changes from which they were to get great advantages--which were impossible of fulfilment--cannot but have had a detrimental effect upon the business and progress of the country. I am glad for this reason that this is now settled, and that Canadians can now turn their faces to the future with a definite idea of what they have to do for themselves and what they may expect from those who live close beside us. For my own part I am not at all afraid to face the future, and to encounter what it has in store for us as to the development and progress of Canada. If the Canadian farmer is to be debarred in great part from a market in the United States for his products, which market at the best is partial, sectional and variable, he will at least have this satisfaction, that under due and adequate protection he will not be exposed to the great and dangerous competition, in the products of this country, from the great western country of the United States. He can prepare himself to find a market for his wares in other countries where they get more favourable entrance, and he can especially prepare himself to enter fully upon that almost inexhaustible market which awaits him for all his products in Great Britain, our mother land. In that country, already, by force of good quality and by prudence in selection, his apples, his cheese, his wheat, his cattle, his bacon and ham, find large and constantly increas-

ing markets, and have to-day secured a permanent place in the market, and practically overtop all competition. And what has been done for these in the British market, by the same careful selection, and the same force of quality, can be done for the beans, the barley, the oats, the lambs, the butter, the poultry, the eggs and all the other great products that the farmer in this country raises, and of which Great Britain takes large and increasing quantities. If the Canadian manufacturer cannot have a fair entrance into the markets of the United States, where he would, of course, meet with strong competition from the accumulations of skill and capital that are there, he can, at least, under the shelter of a proper protection, supply the great and growing home market for manufactures, and with a stability ensured at home, he can push his wares into those countries where they find entrance on more favourable terms. I was speaking, Sir, a moment ago as to the English market in connection with the farm products of this country. I have here a table, in which I give the figures in round numbers, not going into particulars, and I find Great Britain in 1891 imported for consumption in that country, in quantity, as follows:—Bacon, 380,000,000 lbs.; salt beef, 27,000,000 lbs.; fresh beef, 224,000,000 lbs.; hams, 135,000,000 lbs.; mutton, 136,000,000 lbs.; pork, 40,000,000 lbs.; butter, 240,000,000 lbs.; cheese, 230,000,000 lbs.; eggs, 106,000,000 doz.; apples, 3,000,000 bbls.; potatoes, 640,000,000 lbs.; and in value, poultry, \$2,000,000; wheat, \$145,000,000; wheat flour, \$50,000,000; barley, \$29,000,000; oats, \$26,000,000; peas, \$4,500,000; beans, \$6,000,000. There, Mr. Speaker, is a market which is easily reached, and possesses the feature of stable permanence in that it is subject to the minimum of home competition, of variation and fluctuation in the way of tariff imposts put upon it from one year to the other, a market made up largely from the non-producing classes, in these respects, who are constantly at work in the hives of busy industry and are continually calling on this country and other countries like situated for food supplies, to make that muscle, brawn and sinew with which they do the manufacturing for so large a portion of the world. We have in that country, besides, a discriminating market, where the best wares are quickly taken at the best prices, and where the material in goods or money is always at hand to pay for that which they purchase. So, Sir, I say we may face towards the old country, and for our varied products, exploit those markets which are sure to prove profitable from their constant, and, indeed, growing demands. And it may also be that, in the near future, considering this war of tariffs, which is taking place the wide world over, considering the discriminating benefits which are given by some countries and denied by others, it may be worth the careful and thoughtful attention of the Government as to whether or not the time is not approaching, if it is not near at hand, when it will become the duty of this Government to hold out the hand of help to those that help us, to repay favour with favour and interest with interest, and to give the best treatment in our markets to those countries which afford to us the best treatment in their markets.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, am sure that if the Minister of Finance has any
Mr. FOSTER

sentiment of gratitude in him, he ought to be extremely grateful to me personally for the opportunity that I afforded him of delivering himself of those very patriotic and glowing sentiments in which he indulged a little while ago. I regret for his sake, not for mine, he did not see fit to read to the House the whole of the letter under my name and signature which appeared in the *London Economist*, of 13th February, because then, like the fabled creature of Shakespeare, his speech would have resembled the toad, which, though ugly and venomous, had a precious jewel in its head. But, as he would not do so, and as my modesty forbids my doing it, I can only call the attention of the House to that letter, every syllable of which I stand by, as I intended to stand by it when I caused it to be published in the *Economist* in reply to the foul slanders on the Liberal party which the subsidized press of the hon. gentleman and his paid agents, or our precious High Commissioner and his gang had been daily circulating to the detriment of all those in this country who desire the real prosperity and advantage of the people of Canada. With respect to the first part of the hon. gentleman's speech, that is to say, his financial statement, I have no particular objection to make to it. That part of it was moulded very much on the lines of the Queen's Speech delivered by His Excellency at the opening of this Parliament: it did not tell us anything that was new, and it omitted all reference to a great number of matters which, at this moment, are, I think, deserving of the most serious attention of the people. The hon. gentleman gave us half a dozen columns of Estimates, half a dozen columns of the Public Accounts, half a dozen columns of the Trade and Navigation Report. So far as his statement went, he was, like some of his predecessors of old, extremely careful with respect to dealing with mint, anise and cummin, but omitted all reference to those weighty and more important matters which, on the present occasion, might well have engaged the attention of the Minister of Finance of this country. I think we had a right to expect something better on the present occasion from the hon. Minister. This is not an ordinary occasion. This is the first opportunity we have had since our last great decennial stock-taking of testing, in the only and the best way in which it can be tested, the real effects of the policy of which that hon. gentleman has been for years the exponent in Parliament. Sir, facts have been laid before this House, facts are contained in these documents under my hand, which might well have startled the most callous, which might well have alarmed the most stupid man in Canada. And, Sir, in face of these facts, what do we find on the part of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues? We find a long array of figures having no bearing at all on the more important points at issue: we find fatuous and silly assertions of prosperity, which—if there be one particle of truth in the statements made from year to year by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and which are contained in the documents laid on the Table of this House by their order—show the result to be that the condition of things in Canada is such as has not been paralleled for at least fifty, if not one hundred years, in any English community having the like opportunities which we possessed. To whom does he make these statements of prosperity? He makes

them to the people of Canada, whom his own detailed records show, as I have proved again and again, to have lost at least one million and a half of their population within the course of the last ten years. He makes them to the people of this Dominion, whose representatives now around me know, that in all but a few favoured localities the value of their property has been diminishing for the last dozen years by leaps and bounds. Perhaps of all men, this hon. gentleman is the very fittest man in the House to stand up and make these assertions here, because he represents a province which has suffered more—as these very records show—through the results of his foolish and wicked policy, than any other province in the Dominion; and because, by a curious combination of facts, the identical constituency of Queen's which that hon. gentleman represents—

Some hon. MEMBERS. King's.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—King's is it—the identical constituency which he represents has the worst record of any of the fifteen subdivisions of New Brunswick to present to the people. Those very facts that I have alluded to ought themselves to have taught the hon. gentleman to have spoken in a more modest tone on the present occasion. I turn, Mr. Speaker, to the records in my hand, and I find that in the Province of New Brunswick, with a total population of 321,231 souls, the results of his policy is shown in the fact that in the course of the last decade New Brunswick has exactly increased 61 souls. New Brunswick, with a population of sixty thousand families, more or less, with a total area not far short of 20,000,000 acres, has gained 61 souls in ten years, and his own particular constituency, to which I alluded, having begun ten years ago with a population of 14,017, being entitled to natural increase of about 3,500, which ought to have given it a population of 17,521, comes out to-day—the hon. Minister of Finance's own constituency—with a population of 12,152, showing a total loss, putting together the positive loss and the natural increase, of 5,369 souls on a population of 12,152.

Mr. FOSTER. What constituency is that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is your own constituency of King's, or whichever it is.

Mr. FOSTER. Look at it again; you had better revise your figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have given my figures. Which of my figures is it that you deny?

Mr. FOSTER. Those that you have read, *in toto*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will give you the time and opportunity now, and here, of refuting them if you can.

Mr. SPEAKER. An experienced parliamentarian like my hon. friend knows that he must address the Chair.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I stand corrected, Sir, but I think you might also remark to my hon. friend opposite, that no member of Parliament in his position is well advised or in order in interrupting another member when he is speaking.

Mr. FOSTER. I admit that, but I hated to see you go wrong.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Be consoled, I have not gone wrong. The hon. gentleman's commissioners of census may possibly have gone wrong, and I am not responsible for the accuracy of their figures, but these figures which I have just given to the House are the exact and literal figures taken from the census returns laid on the Table of Parliament by hon. gentlemen opposite. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government records be true—and be it remembered he has no reason to doubt them—these records show that during the last ten years during which the hon. gentleman and his friends have administered the Government of Canada, the total loss of population almost equals one man in three of our present population, taking as correct the statement that the Government brought 900,000 immigrants to settle in Canada. I call the attention of the House to the conditions under which this monstrous loss has taken place. Had such a loss occurred in an old country, a thickly-populated country, even in such a country no wise statesman would have passed it with indifference, but, Mr. Speaker, it has occurred in Canada, a country which contains an almost unlimited area of absolutely virgin soil, the greater part of which at this day is utterly unoccupied, which is capable of sustaining not the million and a half that we have lost, but is abundantly capable of sustaining, under a wise and honest Government, ten times, twelve times, fifteen times, aye, twenty times our present population. There is hardly a single province in this Dominion, as I said, in which with a wise and honest Government, it would not be possible to find prosperous and profitable employment for all this million and a half of people whom the Government have driven away. More than that. Not merely have we an almost unlimited area to develop, but we have, besides, exposed the older provinces in this community to almost unexampled sacrifices, and we have incurred a most enormous expenditure, which can only properly be measured by hundreds of millions of dollars, for the purpose of developing the settlement of the country. Great as the loss in quantity has been, there is not a man in this House who has paid the slightest attention to the character of the exodus which has been going on for so many years, who does not know that the loss in quantity is far indeed from being the true measure of the loss the people of Canada has sustained. Sir, it is not the dregs or the refuse of our people that are going from us; it is the very choice and flower of our population. An enormous percentage of this emigration which I deplore is composed of men between twenty and forty years of age; men in the very prime and vigour of life, and I believe that it is to-day calculated by American statisticians that there are more New Brunswickers and more Nova Scotians, between the ages I have mentioned, to be found in Massachusetts and the sister New England states than remain in the provinces which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues represent. Under these circumstances, we have a right to expect one of two things from the hon. gentleman. We have a right to expect an explanation of how these things have come about, or we have a right to expect a confession that his policy and the policy of his colleagues has been, as we have all along contended from first to last, a failure and a fraud. Sir, I pause to examine the wretched subterfuges which the subsidized press of the Government, and members of the Government themselves

on various occasions have had recourse to for the purpose of diminishing the weight of the facts which they were compelled to place before the country. First of all, I note that on almost all the occasions on which they allude to this state of things, their chief plea is this, that in some insignificant corners of the United States, where the soil is less fertile, and from which for many reasons the people for a long time back have been in the habit of migrating to some other parts of the United States, a somewhat similar state of things prevails to that which exists in Canada. Sir, if that were true, there is this essential difference between the two conditions of things: The citizen of the United States who migrates from one state to another still remains a citizen of the United States; he does not forswear his allegiance or seek shelter under a foreign flag, but continues to swell the resources and to increase the population of the United States. But how is it with us? We all know very well that only the smallest fragment of the population we lose finds its way from one part of Canada to another part of Canada. We know that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has resulted in this, that during the last ten years they have driven into exile far more than a million of the best citizens of Her Majesty. But, Mr. Speaker, the statement which these hon. gentlemen have made, that things are the same in the United States, is not by any means a truthful statement of the facts. It may be true as regards Vermont, Maine or New Hampshire; but as regards that great group of states which adjoin Canada, and which are substantially in the same position as Canada, there is not a particle or vestige of truth in the statement. Sir, I will take the case of Massachusetts; I will take the case of New York; I will take the case of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan and North Dakota; and I invite hon. gentlemen in this House, as well as all Canadians who care to ascertain the real facts of the case, to compare the facts recorded in the last census of the United States with the allegations so freely made by these hon. gentlemen. In 1880 Massachusetts had a total population of 1,785,000; in 1890 this had risen to 2,238,000. In the corresponding ten years the population of the five older provinces of Canada had risen exactly 325,000, on a population of over 4,000,000. So that it is plain that Massachusetts, with a little less than half of our population, gained 50 per cent more than all the five older provinces of Canada, and very nearly three times as much as our own magnificent Province of Ontario, which possesses far greater natural resources and far greater opportunities of absorbing a larger population than Massachusetts can possibly show. I turn to the State of New York, and I find that in 1880 it had a population of 5,082,000, which in ten years had swollen to 5,997,000, being an increase of 915,000, very nearly treble the increase of our older provinces on very much the same population. I take the case of Pennsylvania, which in the ten years increased in population from 4,282,000 to 5,258,000. Now, the population of Pennsylvania is almost identically the same as that of Canada; and yet in 1891 it had increased by 976,000, or treble the increase in the population of all our older provinces, and double the total increase of all Canada put together. Ohio increased from 3,198,000 in 1881, to 3,672,000 in 1891, a gain of 474,000. Michigan, beginning with 1,636,000, increased to 2,093,000, being a gain of 457,000. North Dakota, beginning with 36,000,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

reached 182,000, being a gain of 146,000. I have called attention to these facts, in order to show how baseless is the allegation made by these hon. gentlemen and their friends that we need not concern ourselves with the facts stated, because, when all is said and done, we are growing in population in the same ratio as the more important states of the United States. Take those states adjoining Canada, not one whit better than our chief provinces, and compare the results; and then judge for yourself whether or not I am justified in saying that it is impossible to show on this continent a fair parallel for the failure to increase the population of the country which marks our case in Ontario and in Canada at large. Then, Sir, they have a second plea, which is well worth attention. That plea has reference to a certain well known peculiarity of modern life. They urge that they are not to blame because for many years back there has been an unfortunate tendency on the part of a large number of our people, in common with many in the United States and in England, to desert the country for the cities. Well, Sir, out of their own mouths these men are condemned. If that tendency does exist as one of the marked features of the present epoch, then beyond all doubt it would have been the duty of wise and prudent statesmen to have endeavoured as far as they could to check that which has become a very mischievous tendency, or, at the very least, not to have wilfully and deliberately legislated in such a way as to increase it. Sir, the policy of this Government has been in every shape and way, from first to last, deliberately to injure the agricultural classes, and deliberately to increase the very tendency of which they complain as springing from a cause which they are unable to control. I am, however, bound to say that the case is not, after all, quite as bad as the Government's records make out. I have never believed, as I have stated over and over again in this House, that the statements so loudly paraded of the success of this Government in bringing immigrants to Canada had the smallest foundation in fact. I never believed that there were 47,000 immigrants in 1881, 112,000 in 1882, 133,000 in 1883, 103,000 in 1884, or 886,000 in the whole space of ten years; and I make the Government a present of this explanation—which is good so far as it goes, inasmuch as, if my view is correct, it diminishes to a considerable extent the apparent lamentable exodus of our people from Canada—that for the last ten years the entire of the reports of the Agriculture Department have been not merely erroneous, but little better than a deliberate fraud—that none of these immigrants, or only the merest fraction of them, ever came to this country. My own belief is that when we obtain proper reports showing the birthplaces of the various inhabitants of Canada, we shall find that so far from nearly 900,000 immigrants having settled in this country, probably not 25 per cent, very possibly not 10 per cent of all those who were brought here, and who have been paid for at the cost of the people of this country, have remained in Canada, and therefore that the position is really less evil, less mischievous, than the Government records would indicate. If they choose to assume that explanation, that their officers and colleagues have been guilty of errors, which, under the circumstances, approach to deliberate frauds, they are welcome to take it and make the best of

it. Looking over the expenditure of nearly \$2,857,000 for immigration purposes since 1881, I am bound to say that my opinion is now, and always has been, that a great proportion of that sum was never expended for proper immigration purposes at all, but went to form a part of the vast corruption fund by virtue of which, and which alone, hon. gentlemen opposite hold their seats. Nevertheless, making all possible deductions, there is no doubt that the condition is most grave. If you choose to analyze the returns which have been laid before us, showing the condition of the rural districts of Canada, you will find a state of things which deserved at least passing mention at the hands of the Minister of Finance. I take these provinces in rotation, and find that in Prince Edward Island, out of three subdivisions for census purposes, two large subdivisions show not only a loss of the whole natural increase but a considerable, absolute and positive loss, and the remaining one shows a positive increase very far below the natural increase of births and deaths. When I come to New Brunswick I find that out of fifteen subdivisions, eight show a positive loss and seven show far below the natural increase. In Nova Scotia, no less than eight subdivisions show a positive loss, nine are below the natural increase, and one only, out of the whole eighteen or nineteen, shows an increase. In Ontario we find thirty-nine subdivisions show a positive loss, forty-two are almost stationary or are below the natural increase, and out of the whole ninety-four or ninety-five, thirteen alone—almost all of them cities—show some increase. In Quebec there are twenty-seven subdivisions showing a positive loss of population, there are thirty-two which are stationary or below the natural increase, and five only can be found which show an increase equal to the natural increase. Now, you will remember that in all these cases, I am supposing that not one single immigrant has been added to the population. I am supposing that of all these 900,000 to whom I have alluded, not one has settled in any of the other parts of this country. I am just simply stating the case as exhibited in the census and looking to the natural increase alone. If any considerable immigration came into these provinces, then no doubt the loss of our natural population would be even larger than I chose to put it down. But, as it is, the case is bad enough. Supposing the natural increase in Prince Edward Island had been equal to that of former years, we have a dead loss in that province of about 27,000 souls; in New Brunswick, we would have a loss of 80,000; in Nova Scotia, a loss of 100,000, calculated on the ordinary percentage of natural increase. In our Province of Ontario, we find ourselves confronted with a loss of 300,000; in Quebec we are confronted with a loss of 230,000, while, if you come to particular constituencies, we find, in the case of the great County of Huron, a loss of 26,000 souls on a population of 58,000; we find in Grey a loss of 15,000, on a population of 76,000; we find in Bruce a loss of 16,000, on a population of 64,000; we find in the County of Oxford a loss of 13,000, on a population of 48,000; in Wellington, a loss of 25,000, on a population of 72,000; in Norfolk, a loss of 12,000, on a population of 37,000; in Perth, a loss of 14,000, on a population of 46,000; in four ridings of Middlesex, a loss of 27,000 on 103,000; and I am very sorry indeed to say that there are many ridings in which the case is considerably

worse, but with the details of which I do not feel it necessary to trouble the House at this moment. Now, there can be no doubt whatever to any man who will take the trouble to study the records of our census, that in the case of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island our Provinces of Ontario and Quebec see their own fate reflected. Allow this policy of isolation, of excessive taxation, to go on to its legitimate end, and before we are ten years older those of us who survive will see Ontario and Quebec in the same retrograde condition in which I am sorry to see the Maritime Provinces now placed. But it all appears to have no sort of weight whatever on the hon. gentleman opposite. Now, I say that this is the direct result, the plain, inevitable, direct result of the policy which has directed the affairs of the Government for the past fourteen years. I say, Sir, that there is no test of the real progress and advancement of a country like ours which can compare for one moment with the test applied by the growth of population, and when we see such results as those I have just depicted taking place in a country like this, with such unlimited resources and capacities for employing a large population, those facts alone condemn, as nothing else possibly could, the policy which has brought about these results. I have never doubted that we committed a most egregious blunder when we were induced, chiefly by the example of the United States, to apply to Canada the policy which prevailed there, chiefly brought about, as everyone knows, by the financial exigencies arising from their civil war: I have never for one moment pretended that I thought the people of the United States committed other than a very great blunder indeed when they committed themselves to a policy of protection. I believe, if they had the wisdom to adhere to their earlier line of policy, they would be to-day far more formidable competitors for the manufactures of the world than they are; but, at the same time, I have always admitted that there were circumstances connected with the United States which rendered it possible and probable that the experiment of protection might be tried there with less injury to the people than in almost any other country we can imagine. These conditions are the exact opposite of those which prevail in Canada to-day. Everything here tends to magnify and increase the mischief of a protective policy just as everything in the United States tends to minimise and diminish it. What is our position? Every human being knows that the products of our various provinces are substantially similar the one to the other. Everyone knows the various provinces have substantially the same climate, are inhabited, to all intents and purposes, by people having the same wants. Everyone knows that the interprovincial trade we have striven so hard to encourage among them is, through no fault of the people but from the geographical necessities of their position, unprofitable, costly and difficult, compared with the trade they could carry on in other quarters. Everyone knows that our market in itself is small, and that that market is really smaller than it seems to be, by reason of those very geographical difficulties which make intercourse among the several provinces unprofitable. Now, if you turn to the United States, what do you find? You find that practically they are a world among themselves, possessing almost every imaginable variety of climate and almost every imaginable variety of

production, and you find what perhaps is more important, that among the forty nations who may be said to compose that Republic, there is to-day the most perfect free trade which ever subsisted between any equal number of people in the world, and it would be far truer, if a fair account were given, to claim the United States as a proof of the enormous benefits which accrue to a country like that from perfect free trade among a great number of communities extending from ocean to ocean, and very nearly from the tropics to the Arctic Sea, than to claim it as an example of the benefits of protection. It is a literal truth, though perhaps it may seem a paradox to state it, that such are the natural advantages of the United States that they might adopt an absolutely prohibitory tariff and it would do them infinitely less damage than a moderate protective tariff would do in a country like this. Of course, these statements belong to the A B C of political economy, but to judge by the utterances that we hear on the other side, to judge by the articles which appear in the subsidized press of hon. gentlemen opposite, and to judge by the speeches of Ministers themselves, these facts have never occurred to their minds, though they actually go to the very bottom of the question as to whether it is wise or prudent for Canada to condemn itself to a policy of protection and practical isolation. I was not sorry to hear the hon. gentleman throw some considerable discredit upon his past protectionist policy. The hon. gentleman, I suppose in a fit of candour, intimated that perhaps the time had come to break down some of those protective barriers and to admit British goods on comparatively equal terms to compete with Canadian manufactures. We desire to cherish any germ of grace, however small or slight, and, if the hon. gentleman will bring down a policy to reduce the taxes on British goods and to extend to British manufacturers the same privileges and rights which the British Government and people afford to our productions going into their markets, I am sure I speak the sentiments of all my hon. friends when I say that we will support him in passing that over the opposition of the Canadian manufacturers. We have no objection to free trade with all the world, if the thing be feasible or practicable. For my own part, I do not see that at this moment the thing is quite as feasible as I would desire it to be, and I am certain that perfect free trade with the United States, perfect free trade and free interchange with the United States, is of more value to the people of Canada than free trade with all the rest of the world, with the United States left out. But, whether you have free trade with all the world or whether you have continental free trade with the people of this continent with whom we are geographically connected, we have no objection, but what we contend, and always have contended, is that your present policy, which is neither continental free trade nor free trade in any shape or form, your present policy of isolation and excessive taxation is, and has been proved to be, the very worst policy for the settlement and development of Canada that any Government ever committed itself to, and I say again that the census returns from which I have quoted afford the most ample and unanswerable argument in support of my position. Now, these three facts stand out very clearly at this present moment, although the hon. gentleman does not choose to admit them.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

First of all, it is clear and plain that Canada has sustained an absolutely unparalleled loss of population in spite of the most prodigious sacrifices and the most prodigious efforts which have been made to retain her people here. In the second place it is clear—let the hon. gentleman cavil at my figures as he may—that Canada is to-day subject to an enormous burden of taxation, if you take the actual taxation and not simply the nominal taxation, if you take not simply the taxation which is paid into the public treasury, but if you take the taxation as it really is—one moiety for the so-called needs of Government and the other moiety which is imposed by the Government to pay their paymasters, the protected manufacturing interests: and I may add that, grave as these burthens are, they have been, despite all the hon. gentleman may say, enormously increased within the past year or so by reason of the operation of this so-called McKinley tariff and the taxation recently imposed by the United States, with this further grave difficulty in our way, that this tax falls with excessive weight on a class of the population already overburdened, because I am sure I need not waste any time in attempting to show that the taxation inflicted by the McKinley tariff falls almost wholly upon the shoulders of the agricultural population from one end of the Dominion to the other. Well, under these circumstances, it is not much to be wondered at that the hon. gentleman is obliged to stand up to-day and to make public confession of the utter failure on the part of the Government and himself to redeem any one of those promises with which they have been deluding the House and the country for so many years. The hon. gentleman has told us unmistakably and clearly that he and his colleagues have utterly failed in their negotiations for reciprocity. He cannot deny—he will hardly attempt to deny—that he has utterly failed in the pledges and promises he made that he would retain our population in this country, and it is at least equally clear that the hon. gentleman has likewise failed utterly in all his attempts to provide a home market for the products of the people. All of these three things their policy depended upon, all of them were essential if their policy was to succeed at all.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before I proceed to discuss the question of the operation of the McKinley Tariff, I will take the opportunity of putting myself right as regards the Minister of Finance on one point. I find that I was in error in one respect as regards the position of things in New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman represents a county which has sustained the greatest positive loss of any county in New Brunswick, but not a county which has sustained the greatest relative loss. I find that he represents the County of King's, not Queen's, as I erroneously supposed; and I find that whereas the County of King's has a population of 25,617 souls, and whereas the natural increase on that ought to have amounted to 6,404, so that had it retained its natural increase without one single immigrant, it ought to have had, in 1891, a population of 32,021 souls; I find that it has a population of 23,094, and that I was thus far in error. I represented the hon. gentle-