

two little islands which could be put twice into my province of Alberta and you would have 30,000 square miles left, and with all kinds of material out of which she had to make the articles of export brought into the country, not even found there as we can find them in such rich abundance here! Shall we as Canadians, in face of a record like that, made in times of peace, be content to follow false fiscal ideals and keep our progress as slow as it has been? Why, Sir, I venture to think that if this country had the courage to face the issue and to apply those principles that it ought to apply, there is no reason why in ten years time Canada should not have 15,000,000 people and be the most marvellous country, or one of the most marvellous countries, in the world. That is my belief in Canadians, and it is my belief in Canada if they will not hamper it. You should increase foreign commerce, you should broaden it out, and you cannot do it by building a Chinese wall around your border. You cannot increase foreign commerce in that way. You must release foreign commerce by taking off the obstacles that prevent its expansion. You must down with your tariff wall and trust to freedom. Why should we not trust to freedom? That is what we are fighting for in Europe. We are fighting for freedom; our sons are dying for it, and we have shouldered the burden in order that the fight for freedom may be brought to a victorious end.

But you say: Oh, yes, but we are fighting for freedom from oppression by a foreign tyrant, for civil and religious freedom, for the freedom of self-government. But what is any freedom worth if you cannot sell in the best market the produce of physical brawn and sinew and effort? We must increase our foreign commerce. That is my next principle.

The fourth principle I want to lay down, and which I think should be easily understood by hon. gentlemen opposite is that we ought to make Canada fiscally as good a country to live in as is the United States. When I first talked tariff in this House (before my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was in it, although he was a keen observer of Canadian affairs at that time) and when I first talked free trade, I was told that by hon. gentlemen opposite that I did not understand this country, that I was up against a condition. It was said to me: Look at the tariff of the United States. Well, I am looking at it, but my hon. friends opposite have stopped looking at it. It is they who are up against a con-

[Mr. M. Clark.]

dition now. My contention on this point is that instead of telling us that there were no tariff changes in the Budget my hon. friend would have shown more fiscal enlightenment if he had put everything on the free list in Canada that is on the free list in the United States. That would be the natural outcome of the principle which was enforced upon me by my hon. friends opposite. That would be in accordance with looking at conditions like those of the United States and looking at the tariff of the United States. I have not made a list of the articles myself but I could give one that occurs to me. Why should we have a 30 per cent tariff on boots and shoes and have free boots and shoes in the United States? Is it because the boot makers of Canada are duffers? I am sure that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), would not admit that for a moment. Why should we have to pay 30 per cent on our boots and shoes with free boots and shoes in the United States? Does Canadian stubble not wear out the farmer's boots, and the boots of the farmer's boys, as fast as the stubble in the United States? Do our streets not wear out the boots of our poor people and of our salaried people that my hon. friend has such compassion for in the matter of an income tax? Do our streets not wear out our boots as fast as the streets in the United States? As a matter of mercy and justice to our own inhabitants why should we maintain a tariff like this? But, there is a deeper reason. We should always try to look at these things as patriotic men who want to try to make our country big and great. We are looking for immigration from the United States and the Director General is moving heaven and earth to get people in from the United States.

Talk about trucking and trading with the Yankees! We would not be convicted of trucking and trading with the Yankees on this side of the House. Bringing people from there and sending wheat there! Is reciprocity dead? It is the liveliest corpse that ever came out of a grave on a resurrection morn. We shall need people to develop our resources, to create wealth, which we shall tax in a direct manner, to produce the material which we shall exchange freely, following the example of the Mother country and leaving forever the example of the Huns. We shall need these people after the war. They might have had the encouragement that I am suggesting, and I really hope that my hon. friend will look into this before he brings in another Budget—according