A NOTABLE SPEECH ON RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT

Dr. Clark, an English Settler in Alberta, Makes a Convincing Reply to Arguments of Trade Restrictionists.

Ottawa, Feb. 24.—One of the most notable features of the debate in the House of Commons on the reciprocity agreement with the United States was the speech of Dr. Michael Clark, member for Red Deer, Alberta. Dr. Clark is an Englishman who a few years ago took up his residence in the Canadian west because of the opportunities it appeared to present for himself and his family. He is a student as well as an agriculturist, and before many years pass will undoubtedly become, by reason of his great talents, a prominent figure in the public life of his adopted country. His speech, which follows, will be read with interest by every person who takes a broad and intelligent interest in the affairs of the Dominion. The reader who studies the Doctor's contribution to the most important debate that has taken place in the Canadian Parliament since Confederation will be amply repaid for his time.

Mr. Michael Clark (Red Deer). Mr. Chairman, I need scarcely say to the House that it is somewhat of a relief to a nervous man to have come through the usual daily amount of guerilla warfare, which naturally will take the place of regular opposition methods, when a tabulated policy, and demoralized largely by the strength and punularity of the policy of the government of the day. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), some little time ago, depicted myself as occupying a somewhat lone position in this House—as being a kind of Canadian Rosebery, ploughing my lonely furror. Well, I am bound to say that there was an admission at the beginning of the speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), that takes away a great deal of my feeling of loneliness to-day; because he said that protection to be of any use, must be protection all round, otherwise it became class legislation, and was doomed to be destroyed. He saw, in what is going on now, the fall of the outworks, and he said the citadel would soon come down. Well, that is very consoling to a lone free-trader in a foreign land; for I should like to point out that we never have had protection all round in this country, and there never has been protection all round in any country upon earth. That is not the nature of the thing; that it not the object of it. The only object of protection is to give a minority the chance of protecting themselves at the expense of the majority. My hon. friend from St. Antoine, and I think, my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid), have indicated the opinion that the western farmers, when they understand this question, will not be so keenly in favor of reciprocity as they are supposed to be at the present time. These hon. gentlemen need not be alarmed. The western farmers have been studying this question for some time, and to a great deal of the speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine, I think I can furnish an answer which was placed in my hand to-day by Mr. Bower, the president of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, who allows me to use his name in saying that the United Farmers of Alberta, the Grain Growers of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and the Grange of Ontario are all unanimously in favor of reciprocity. The grain growers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the Grangers of Ontario are unanimously in favor of reciprocity.

Mr. Bradbury: That is the political machine.

Mr. Clark (Red Deer): Am I to understand that my hon. friend is opposed to reciprocity?

Mr. Bradbury: Most undoubtedly, as you propose it.

Mr. Clark (Red Deer): Then I can only say that there will be more lonely men than myself, if I understand anything of the opinion of the western farmers and the meaning of legislation such as this.

I have been frequently called a theorist on this question, and I suppose that my hon. friend from St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames) is put forth as a man of affairs, who understands business, and who approaches the consideration of politics from the business standpoint. Well, in that connection I was surprised to hear him suggest, apparently seriously, the giving of a three cent per bushel bounty on the raising of wheat. In the west last year we raised in the neighborhood of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat. Three cents per bushel bounty on that would amount to a trifle of $3,000,000 bonus to begin with, and we have only begun cultivating wheat in the west. Does my hon. friend want this House seriously to believe that he and his friends would put in that as a serious proposition before the people, and then pose in this House as a man of business who wants to be considered a practical politician. I dismiss a suggestion of that kind without further comment. You cannot goldbrick the farmers of this country with a proposition of that kind.

My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) further said that the cattle raisers of Alberta were convinced they would lose their market. How did my hon. friend come to know the opinion of the Alberta raisers of cattle? I am in a small way an Alberta raiser of cattle myself, and I do not think the market for that cattle is likely to be lost; but there is no answer to what Mr. Asquith has aptly termed the sloppiness of the protectionist argument. Actually the logical protectionist speaking in the person of the hon member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), says that the multiplication of markets means the loss of markets. Well, with gentlemen who argue in that fashion, it is impossible to continue a serious or relevant discussion.

If the House will extend me its patience a little while, I should like to make a few remarks on the general aspect of this question, and also reply to some of the objections we have heard, and I trust that my remarks will be strictly pertinent to the debate as far as it has gone. Personally I should be quite content to leave the defence of the position of the government as it was left by the speech of the minister of customs (Mr. Paterson) the first night of the debate. The hon. minister (Mr. Paterson) in that speech was logical, forcible, cogent and commendedly brief. There is another quality in that speech which we should all endeavor to imitate, and that is that he looked at the thing from the broad national standpoint. My hon. friend reminded me of some one who had been living for some time in a very inhospitable climate and had suddenly found his youth and vigor restored by returning once more to breathe his native air. But the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition reminds me of the man who is still living in an inhospitable clime and likely to remain there much longer.

I find myself, however, in agreement with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when they said that Canada was big enough to look after her own tariffs, and to make her own tariffs independently of other countries. But if I agree in that, it is as a free trader. I learned the doctrine in the form of an aphorism from a great Conservative—possibly the greatest Conservative leader—who was at the head of the Conservative party in England in the 19th century, a great financier, the teacher of Mr. Gladstone in matters of finance, and the man to whom Mr. Gladstone, to the very end of his career, referred always in terms of veneration and respect. Sir Robert Peel, after eight years of instruction at the hands of Cobden, came to repeal the corn laws, and laid down what I conceive to be sound philosophy to-day, as it was then, with regard to tariffs, and that is that the best way to combat hostile tariffs is by a system of free imports. As a free trader, therefore, I am bound to endorse the position that Canada is big enough to attend to her own tariffs. That was the theory laid down by Sir Robert Peel, and which has been put in practice by the greatest commercial nation in the world during seventy years, and how has it worked out? It has worked out, as good theories always do. It has been proved by practice up to the hilt. Take for instance what has happened as regards trade between the United States and Great Britain. Britain takes the imports all right, she gets wire nails from the United States at $6.50 per ton for which the people of the United States pay $10 per ton. As a man who uses wire nails, I prefer to buy them at $6.50 per ton rather than at $10 per ton. A well educated American told me lately that, to his own knowledge, fencing wire manufactured in Rochester is taken across the Atlantic to Britain and then reshipped to Brazil and sold in Brazil cheaper than in Rochester where it is made. That is dumping, and Britain gets the cheap goods. Sir Robert Peel said that free imports are the best method of overcoming hostile tariffs. How does Britain get on after seventy years experience of hostile tariffs? At this juncture it is sufficient for me to say that British ships plough through the hostile tariff of the United States to such an extent that she exports more manufactured goods to the United States than to any other country in the world. Britain, with her free imports, commands the trade all around. She gets the cheap goods and compels the other countries to take her manufactures in exchange. Sir Robert Peel was a great Conservative statesman and financier, and when he made an aphorism in political economy he made it for all time.

I have ventured to trespass on the patience of the House in order to illustrate why I am an adherent of the position taken by the opposition in this regard. But, how does the position accord with their theory? How does it lie in their mouths to state that they believe Canada is big enough to make her own tariff? Another example of the sloppiness of the protectionist argument. Why, in the mother country the friends of my hon friends opposite have for seven years been telling the people that one of the main uses of a tariff is to bargain with other countries. That is the main item in the protectionist programme of Great Britain. It is the main contention of every man advocating a protectionist fiscal policy. And, yet, when it suits their purpose, my hon. friends come forward and say that this is the main use of a tariff, but how dare these two ordinary gentlemen put a tariff to that particular use?

I am in agreement with another position of these hon. gentlemen. I concede that history will probably record that the reciprocity arrangement, which I trust will soon go into effect, took its origin in the economic necessities of the United States people and the political necessities of the Republican party. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in taking up that position, makes a lone free trader still more comfortable, because he says that it arose from these conditions and we need only have waited for it. What is that but a contention that protection is breaking down in the United States? Does he want Canada to embark upon a foolish policy which the United States people now feel they have to run away from? My hon. friend from North Toronto is coming to see what Mr. Lloyd George sees very clearly in England, for he stated the other day—truthfully, as I think—that the ice of protection is cracking all over the world.

Well, now, what is it that the government has done against which such complaints are formulated? As my hon. friend from Richmond, N. S. (Mr. Kyte) pointed out in his very able speech, they have remitted over $3,000,000 of taxation. And hon. gentlemen opposite would like to contend that this was in answer to their criticism or at any rate in accordance with their expressed wishes. Well, it is not a very horrible thing to remit two millions of taxation. No government that I have ever lived under sought, and received, gratitude from a reasonable population for giving any remission whatsoever in taxation. But I do not know that I have any right to include the hon. member from North Toronto in any reasonable population. The argument of my hon. friend from Richmond is capable of extension. These hon. gentlemen opposite have not only been telling the government, ever since I came to this House, that the government have broken pledges to reduce taxation, but they have also said: "You promised to find us new markets, and you have not done it." Now the government find new markets, and those hon. gentlemen say: "How dare you do it?" Well, what can you do with a front bench of an opposition like that? The hon. gentleman also says: "The government has taken steps to increase the trade of the country." How horrible! I wish hon. gentlemen opposite would read what John Bright said and apply it to economics, to trade. He said that he failed to find any different code of morality for a nation than that which would apply to a man. Well I cannot find a different code of economic laws, or trade laws, for a nation than I do for a man. When did my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) fail to develop any opportunity that presented itself of expanding his business? Well, Canada is only an aggregation of human beings something like my hon. friend from St. Antoine, and the government of Canada has as plain a duty in regard to extending the trade of Canada as it has in looking after the taxation of Canada and in finding new markets. They have remitted taxation; they have found new markets; they have extended our trade. And hon. gentlemen opposite say: "How dare you do it?—you are breaking up the constitution!"

Now, I want to say a few words on the economic out come of this policy as it appeals to me. I notice that the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto were very non-committal on this point, in fact, the leader of the oppositon accomplished the extraordinary feat in his speech in the first night of the debate of taking up an hour and twenty minutes on a reciprocity agreement. This non-committal attitude, so far as the hon. member for North Toronto is concerned, is chronic with him in such circumstances, for I find that in 1897, he spoke of the scope of the tariff which was being introduced at that time by my hon. friend the minister of finance (Mr. Fielding) and its effect on the interests of the country, and he had to confess candidly that he had not been able to make up his mind yet on these particulars. That is just why the proper place for him was opposition; and that is just why the proper people were in control of the government. Those in control of the government were able to frame a fiscal policy for the good of the country, and they could see well what was to come out of that policy, as all hon. gentlemen opposite now know what actually has come out of it. They are wise after the event; therefore, opposition is the proper place for them. But some of their number at that time were not so reticent, as was pointed out by the postmaster general (Mr. Lemieux) the other evening. 'Industry paralysed!' 'Industry destroyed!' The 'wall of industry.' In 1897, this was what some of these hon. gentlemen talked about. Why, it was necessary to add an adjective to describe it, so it was called 'the woeful wail' of industry. Sir Charles Tupper used that language (he might have been anticipating the speech my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) made the other night) the woeful wail of the manufacturers of Canada in the Montreal Gazette. The woeful wail has been patented now, and is being sold by the yard, accompanied by a life-like photograph of the Prime Minister to give some credit to the thing.

There are some prophecies concerning what is going to come out of this arrangement that will not be fulfilled. I venture upon that prophecy very firmly. I think it is a safe position because the prophets are driven to contradict one another and themselves, and their prophecies cannot all work out. It is clear that this arrangement cannot at the same time ruin the Canadian consumer and the Canadian producer of the products that are being consumed (or not being consumed; I do not know what hon. gentlemen opposite really think is going to happen then)—but that is what we are being told, on one hand there is a reason for the greatest alarm on account of the consumer, and on the other hand that the producers of the goods to be consumed are ruined. I think we may confidently look to the nonfulfilment of one of these prophies. There is some part of the "woeful wail" that will not work out. Now, my hon. friend from North Toronto gave a very good example of his capabilities in the way of prophecy by being a double prophet in his long speech. One of the difficulties of a speech of four hours' duration is that a man is almost sure to forget at the end what he said at the beginning. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) spent three hours in trying to prove that this arrangement would be the disruption of the Empire, the ruin of Canadian nationality, and the end of all things. And then, at the end of his speech he turned round quite coolly and said: This is not a reciprocity arrangement at all, it is simply a matter of exchange of jack-knives. We on this side of the House do not regard the British Empire and Canada as quite such flimsy things that they are going to be destroyed by an exchange of jack-knives.

Now, with regard to the effects of this arrangement upon the people of Canada, I think it is a good, sound position to take that trade makes prosperity, that prosperity makes for increased wealth, that prosperity and increased wealth must mean more employment to labor, and benefit all round. Why, Sir, that is capable of very simple proof. Last year this government—which has never reduced any tariffs, which has continued the National Policy, though, by the way, a year after they came into power they were going to ruin the industries of the nation by departing from the National Policy—but that is a small inconsistency—a year ago this government made an arrangement with regard to the German surtax. I was in Prince Edward county ten days ago, and I met a gentleman there who is engaged largely in the evaporated fruit industry, and he told me that at the time that arrangement with Germany was come to, he had 600 cases of evaporated fruit which he could not place. The moment the arrangement was made he got $300 more for those 600 cases by selling them to Germany than he could have got before the arrangement was made. I think that is very practical proof that the lowering of tariffs promotes trade, that trade promotes prosperity and wealth, because that $300, or what it represents, would come into Canada, be circulated in Canada, and to that modest extent would increase material prosperity of the Canadian people.

Now, I think that Mr. Scallion, who came down with the grain growers, put the case for reciprocity in a brief and convincing shape. I was surprised to see that so prominent a man as Premier Roblin, of Manitoba, yesterday said that no one had asked for reciprocity. Well, that is an extraordinary statement for the premier of the province to make, where the grain growers have their headquarters, and it is very scant courtesy to Mr. Scallion to say that no one asked for reciprocity. Mr. Scallion pointed out in so many words what he thought would be the benefit to the farmers of extending their markets; he pointed out that there would be opposition along certain lines, and I must say that he portrayed very accurately the lines of opposition which we have had elaborated in this House. Then he asked the very practical question with regard to this breaking up of the Empire. He said: We do $350,000,000 of trade with the United States now, and I would like to know the exact amount of trade which would be dangerous, because there is no question that, while we have been doing that trade, it has not been leading to the destruction of the Empire.

Now, Sir, I do not know that I would dare to make some of the prophecies that are being made about the effects this arrangement will have upon the price of special commodities. I do not think that a lowering of the tariff is likely to raise prices to the consumers of the country; yet I am sure that so far as the west is concerned it will benefit the producers. The farmer in the west stands very largely to benefit by the increased price of his land holdings. It is the magnificent prerogative of Canada to-day to offer to immigrants a splendid heritage of free land and independence in the possession of their land. I think if we get this prosperity I am talking of, the farmers will benefit by the increase of their wealth, such is the fortunate position of this great country, without damaging consumers at all. As a free trader, I should regret if any lowering of the tariffs led to the punishment for one moment of the consumers. There may be temporary inconveniences, there may be temporary upsets of things in certain localities, but we believe benefit will be the broad outcome of the policy.

Now, I want to look for a few moments at some of the main positions which were taken up in a very serious argument by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), some of the main positions which were not dealt with at all by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). I certainly think that with those parts he did deal with, he proved to be a successful controversialist. But I think there was an argument presented which deserves the consideration of some one in this House; because, when the hon. member for North Toronto favors us with his views at such length he naturally commands our attention, our respectful attention, and his arguments in favor of protection, and, therefore, against the reciprocity arrangement, have to be examined. Now, the member for North Toronto said: There is a labor question involved in this. I may say that I listened to every word of his speed, and I took notes of it; that was all I needed to do to give due respect to my hon. friend. After all, if one listens to a speech of four hours and then has to read it, one would be forgetting what was due to the consideration of the brevity of human life. I will endeavor not to misrepresent my hon. friend's position in any way. There was a suggestion of hurt to labor. There is great solicitude on the part of protectionists for labor. The laboring men, of course, in a democratic country, like this, have votes, and unless the laborers can be deluded into supporting protection the thing is doomed past all redemption. It is pathetic in the extreme to find the interests interested in labor. It is one of the hoary-headed fallacies with which error has bolstered itself, and reappears generation after generation. When Mr. Cobden was fighting in Great Britain 60 or 70 years ago for the repeal of the corn laws, he made great fun of the contention that British labor would be hurt by cheap labor somewhere up the Baltic. He said: I do not know where it is, but it is somewhere up the Baltic, and British labor is going to be ruined by it. I wish that hon. gentlemen who talk upon this labor question would reflect that the very things they are saying in regard to this reciprocity question hurting Canadian labor are being said on the American side about the cheap Canadian labor hurting American labor. That would surely, even to the most partisan intellect, bring conviction that there is nothing in this outcary. What are the facts about labor? There was this peculiarity in the portion of the speech of my hon. friend with which I am dealing, which deposes me from the position of the champion theorist in this House, for, as regards some of the figures, they were knocked into the proverbial cocked hat by the hon. member for South Wellington. In defending his theory of protection he gave the facts of the history of commerce the widest berth it was possible to do. I am in the memory and judgment of the House when I say that his speech along these lines was pure theory, woven out of his own brain. He might never have known there was a history of commerce; he might never have known there was trade going on all over the world among the nations of the earth. I want very briefly to follow an exactly opposite method and to cede to my hon. friend willingly any honor there is in being a pure theorist. What are the facts that bear upon this argument of how far labor is going to be hurt? It is beyond possibility of contradiction that the best paid labor in Europe to-day is the labor of the British islands, whether skilled or unskilled, and I take it that that nearly ends the argument, because there is no fair comparison between the labor of Great Britain and the labor of this continent; labor on this continent is so scare that it is bound to be highly paid, and protection, in my mind, has nothing whatever to do with it. I take it that that fact is an argument which cannot be contradicted, and nearly ends all discussion upon the subject.

Mr. Hudson, a well known British economist, wrote a pamphlet a short time ago in which he showed as clearly as statistics can prove anything that in the United States under the McKinley tariff the proportion of the total wealth of the country going to labor was smaller than under the lower Wilson tariff, and that the proportion of wealth going to labor under the lower Wilson tariff raised and then under the Dingley tariff it sank once more. The fact is that there is nothing in this world so striking as the exploitation of labor by protection. Will the House allow me to give an example, for this is a strange statement to make. I read recently a book by a member of the Philadelphia bar on the tariff. The evidence is by a cultured and educated American. He tells us, and I can almost repeat it in his own language, how the article borax was sold in the United States of America for $50 a ton until there was discovered in the United States the richest mine of borax in the world. That mine is situated in California and the neighboring states. Having discovered the rich mine, the author says a great misfortune fell upon the American people. The discovery of a rich mine should not be a misfortune to a people, but the writer goes on to prove his case. He said that the moment the mine was discovered it needed to be protected, and through the proper influences at Washington, it got protection under the McKinley tariff, 5 cents a pound was put on borax; under the Wilson tariff it fell to 2 cents a pound, and under the Dingley tariff it was put back to 5 cents a pound. A very simple calculation will reveal to the House that that is $100 a ton, and the price of borax to the American consumer immediately rose to $150 a ton, while the borax was taken to the coast of the Atlantic and sold to Germany and Britain in competition with the world at $50 a ton. Oh, but say the protectionists, it is necessary to protect American capital. Unfortunately for that argument, the author says, every cent of the capital working that mine is the capital of a British syndicate. Yes, but the protectionist is not so easily bowled out. What about labor, look at the protection of labor—and this is the point that pertains to the argument which I am contending against, that there is going to be any injury to labor in this reciprocity arrangement. It is a very unfortunate position to be driven to for the protectionist, because my author informs us that the borax is dug out of the mine by Chinese coolies living in shacks. That is a fair example of how labor is protected by this system, and goes far to justify my statement that protection is the greatest exploiter of labor in the world.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had something to say about interprovincial trade. If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery he should feel flattered, because Premier Roblin yesterday repeated most of what he said, in the Manitoba House, and the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) dealt liberally with him in the same fashion. I wish to cite a few figures in this connection. In my opinion the hon. member for North Toronto was on very, very weak ground when he spoke lightly of the importance of foreign trade. I do not think I misrepresent him, I am sure I do not desire to, when I say he spoke lightly of foreign trade. I think it is capable of exact proof that there is no surer test of the greatness of a nation than its foreign trade. If I were to ask any hon. member on either side what are the four greatest nations in the world I should get the same answer from every one of them, the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany and France, perhaps in a different order of preference; if I did not happen to be a modest man, I might have put Great Britain first. That would be the universal consensus of thinking men anywhere. Yes, Sir, but these four nations are also at the head of the foreign trade of the world. I take it that this is almost a proof that you can have no better test of the greatness of a people than by its foreign trade, and no better test of the rapidity with which it is marching to greatness than by the way it is expanding its foreign commerce, and it is a matter of congratulation to us on both sides of the House that Canada is the country that is making the most rapid advances in this direction.

The next proposition I should like to lay down in regard to what fell from my hon. friend on interprovincial trade is that there is no real quarrel between interprovincial trade and foreign trade; on the contrary they advance, in my judgment, pari passu. Does the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) think there is no interprovincial trade in Germany or in Great Britain or in France? Does he not know that there is interstate trade, but that these nations also have the greatest foreign trade in the world? There is no quarrel between interprovincial trade and foreign trade.

I wish to offer an illustration upon that point. In 1893, an interesting year, three years before the change of government, the foreign trade of Canada was $247,000,000 all told, export and import. That was when my hon. friends were building a nation under the National Policy, and when the finances of this country were under the guidance of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In the year 1894, the year after that, the foreign trade and commerce had dropped from $247,000,000 to $240,000,000, and in the year 1895, the figures had dropped still further to $224,000,000. I should like to ask any candid hon. gentleman on the other side of the House whether Canada at that time, when her foreign trade was not only insignificant but diminishing, had an interprovincial trade that was anything to boast about? There was no west for the east to trade with. Talk of the prosperity of Canada having a growth of 40 years. I have not been in Canada 40 years, I have not been here since 1896—I am very glad I came after 1896—but I can read the story of simple and plain figures and the simple and plain figures teach me what I wish to present with all respect to my hon. friend that when the foreign trade was insignificant and diminishing the interprovincial trade was small too.

But, this is not a matter of figures and of theories only, is it not a matter of common sense? What is the object of Canada in all of her policies at the present time? What is the object of her immigration policy; what is the object of her transportation policy—the one object is to get a huge surplus of wealth from out of the land, the great heritage which the Almighty has given us. And surely when we get that surplus it is common sense to know that we must and can only dispose of it by foreign trade. Allied to this argument is what my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) said about the frightening of capital; he told us Britain's capital is going to be frightened from Canadian investment. Well, I cannot think so. I received a letter yesterday telling me that two acquaintances of mine in the north of England, and their wives are coming here in May, and they have considerable capital; they are not frightened; I talked with a young Northumbrian the other night who told me he had a letter from a young man who was sailing in the month of March to Canada, and as they are somewhat politicians in Northumberland, this young man who is coming out wrote congratulating my friend, who is one of the free-traders so scarce in this country according to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), on the fact that he was living in Canada, where the fiscal policy was approximating to the fiscal policy of Great Britain. I would like to ask my hon. friend whether he thinks the financiers of Great Britain will be really frightened to embark their capital in an atmosphere of freer trade when they know very well they made all of that capital in an atmosphere of absolute free trade. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) also said that this policy was inimical to our industries, and as the hon. gentleman has been courteous enough to come into the chamber I ought perhaps to tell him that I heard every word of his speech but I excuse myself from the double task of both hearing it and reading it on the ground that life is somewhat brief. I shall endeavor, from the notes I took as I heard it, to state fairly his position. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said that this trade arrangement was inimical to the building up of the industries of Canada. We hear that outcry from various quarters and I must say it is rather a curious outcry considering the source it comes from, for were I a manufacturer I should have lain as low as 'brer rabbit' at this particular moment. What does the outcry from that particular quarter mean; what is making them cry out? Personally, I would have made them cry a good deal harder if that were possible. They cried hard enough in 1897—industries were paralyzed and destroyed then according to them, and I do not know that we can do much more to a thing that first to paralyze and then destroy it. But no disaster happened to them then, and somehow or other I do not feel it is going to happen to them now. To be serious upon this point, I do think that the great moneyed interests do not live up to their responsibilities when they oppose thus lightly what I believe to be a policy that is supported by the great masses of the people of this country. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition seemed to lend himself to this argument: That the policy of reciprocity and of freer trade is inimical to the building up of industries, and I must say that in this respect he did not follow his usual custom of carefully buttressing his position by facts. The hon. gentleman said twice over in a somewhat demonstrative way, that the United States was the greatest manufacturing country in the world. Well, I should not make superlative statements about anything unless I were prepared to offer some evidence. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) did for once stoop to figures at this point, and he seemed to think it was a wonderful thing to turn to his followers and say: Why the United States of America exported $440,000,000 worth of manufactured goods last year. Well, they live on a continent and they have 90,000,000 of inhabitants, and they have protection thrown in to help them. I was reared in a small country, the country of Britain, and I am sure my hon. friends opposite who are the British party will be glad to hear what Britain has done. You could put the United Kingdom twice over into the province of Alberta so that her area is somewhat restricted for carrying on her operations, and she only has 45,000,000 people as against 95,000,000 in the United States, and my hon. friend thinks that $440,000,000 worth of manufactured goods is a wonderful record under protection. Well, I think it is, but free trade is a different matter. What does he think the exports of manufactured goods from Great Britain were last year, exclusive of ships—£334,000,000 sterling worth. If you multiply that by five you will get somewhere around $1,670,000,000 worth of manufactured goods from a little country which is having imports dumped on it from all the world, and which according to all protectionist theories ought to have had its manufacturing industries destroyed off the face of the earth. There has been some talk of an expert tariff commission upon how industries are built up, and if I may trespass on the time of the House, I should like to give a little expert testimony. Mr. W. H. Lever is the biggest soap man in the world. By the way I might remark that we manufacture in free trade England, as little things as soap and as big as Mauretanians, although my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) tells me, without proof, that the United States is the greatest manufacturing nation in the world.

Mr. Borden (Halifax). I meant by that, that I was under the impression, and I am still under the impression, that the manufactured product of the

(Concluded on page 12.)

COMPLETES CHARTER IN MEXICO SERVICE

Henley Makes Last Trip From Salina Cruz—Brings Considerable Freight

Making her last trip under charter to the Canadian-Mexican Steamship Company, the liner Henley, Capt. Banan, reached the outer wharf early on Saturday from Salina Cruz and way ports. After a fair trip up the coast the vessel arrived at the William Head quarantine station last night, but was too late for inspection and had to remain there until this morning. The vessel has occupied fifteen days in making the passage northward and had but three days rough weather. When nearing Cape Flattery she encountered the only spell of heavy weather running into a strong gale from the north, which battered her about severely. In the heavy seas she shipped considerable water but no damage was done to her.

While in the service of the Mexican line the Henley has made four trips to Salina Cruz. Shortly after the company resumed its sailings to the south the Henley was chartered to run alternately with the Lonsdale in place of the Georgia, which was formerly used. The vessel has been found to be a useful ship as she is a fine freighter and has some accommodation for passengers. The Henley with the expiration of her charter with the Mexican concern within a few weeks, is to be replaced by the new steamship St. Ronald, which recently arrived here from Antwerp.

It is understood that before long the Canadian-Mexican Steamship Company will secure another vessel for the run to operate with the Lonsdale and St. Ronald. The traffic between Victoria, Vancouver and Mexican ports is building up rapidly and before long three boats wll be required to handle the business. The officials of the company have their eyes open looking for a suitable vessel and may secure one before long.

General freight to the amount of 1,500 tons was brought north by the Henley, of which little over one hundred tons was discharged here. Some of it was from eastern Canada, while considerable is from Eng'and and other European countries, all being shipped across from the Atlantic on the Tehuantepec railway. The vessel brought a good sized jigger of alcoholic beverages including some whiskey from celebrated Scottish brewers, ale from celebrated English makers, and a good deal of gin. For Victoria 100 cases of Scotch whiskey were discharged together with considerable other general cargo. Twenty tons of pig iron was unloaded here and for Vancouver the steamship has a large quantity of iron rails for the B. C. Electric Company.

TO BUILD NEW CHURCH.

Vancouver, March 3.—At a meeting of Catholic residents in and around Cedar Cottage it was decided to proceed with the erection of a new church at Cedar Cottage. A committee of nine was appointed to carry out the preliminary arrangements.

An interesting little book is at present being compiled and will be issued next month. It will be a record of the work of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate from the first landing of the pioneers in Victoria to the present time, transference of the Oblate to the mainland, and a history of their work and results will be given, with a list of the parishes and missions served by them in British Columbia.

Following the appointment of Father Tavernier, O. M. I., as pastor of the proposed new Oblate church at Kitsilano, Father V. Rohr, O. M. I., formerly of Mission City, and lately on leave of absence to visit Alsace-Lorraine, is on his return trip from his native land. On his arrival in the province he will be appointed superior of St. Mary's Mission, Mission City, in succession to Father Tavernier. Father J. P. O'Neill, assistant at Mission City, will be transferred to William's Lake greatly to the regret of his Fraser Valley friends, and his post at Mission City will be taken by Father J. Lepage, O. M. I., who will leave New Westminster.

BOARDS OF EXAMINERS.

The Council of Public Instruction has appointed the following as a board of examiners to act with the Supt. of Education at the examination of public school teachers for 1911:—William P. Argue, Miss Jeanette A. Cann, Henri Chodat, Percy H. Elliott, John S. Gordon, Joseph K. Henry, David C. Little, Stanley W. Mathews, Edward B. Paul, Lemuel Robertson, George E. Robinson, Ernest H. Russell, Samuel J. Willis, David Wilson, and the following public school inspectors to be sub-examiners, to take charge of the various examination centres throughout the province, and mark candidates in reading:—George H. Deane, John D. Gillis, Thomas Leith, Albert E. Miller, Donald L. MacLaurin, John T. Pollock and Albert Sullivan.

FOUND DEAD.

Nelson, March 3.—Under circumstances surrounded by mystery the body of an Indian woman named Mary Ann Christie, who was last seen at Castlegar on Monday evening, was found face downwards near the river at a point about a mile east of Castlegar on Wednesday. News of the discovery was brought to the city by the brother of the dead woman. Ali Christie's story was that he last saw Mary on Monday morning, when he sent her to Westley to see some fur skins. Becoming alarmed at her non-appearance he commenced a search. An interesting feature of the Indian's tale is the statement that upon making an examination of the ground near where he found the body he noticed tracks of a man. Foul play is suspected.

The largest stalactite cave in Europe recently was discovered in the Dachstein mountains of Upper Austria.