

he will not sit down without answering it: Is he in favour of a protective tariff for this country—any protective tariff?

Mr. PUTNAM: I did not forget my hon. friend's academic question, although it was very much out of order just at that stage. Let me ask the hon. gentleman another question—because I am not afraid to make the discussion a little conversational. When he says he believes in modifying our immigration policy to the extent of warning immigrants that if our present protective tariff is lowered the field in Canada for those immigrants will be uninviting, does he speak for himself or for his whole party?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I generally speak for myself, and I am prepared to take the consequences of what I say. If the hon. gentleman wants to advertise to the world that this country is prepared to accept a tariff that is not protective he will not have any sympathy in connection with the result obtained if he seeks to get immigrants. He cannot hope for success if the policy of this country is going to be no protection at all—or free trade, which the hon. member would seem to be arguing for.

Mr. PUTNAM: If the hon. member were in a position of enough prominence—and I say it without disrespect—to look to the good of the whole world, would he advocate a protective tariff—

Mr. RYCKMAN: Looking to the good of the whole world I am simply a back bencher.

Mr. PUTNAM: I put an "if" to it, as my hon. friend must have noticed. I suppose my hon. friend agrees that very largely the products of the farms of Canada must be exported to foreign countries to find a market.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Less than 20 per cent.

Mr. PUTNAM: My hon. friend seems to be in favour of every country in Christendom putting up tariff barriers and having its own protection. Where would he find a foreign market if every country resorted to the device of protection, a device which has the effect of keeping out the products of other countries? Occasionally we are told—and I dislike repeating what I very poorly said in the short speech I made in the debate on the Address—that the protective policy of the United States is proof that protection itself will not disturb the sequence of events in the building up of the industry of a new country. I deny in toto that proposition. The United States has a great variety of climate and soil conditions. The labour of man applied to the various sections of that country in all its

different capacities produces a variety of products almost infinite in their complexion, and within that country those products are exchanged on a basis of free trade. It was not until the period between 1816 and 1830 that any tariff legislation was enacted in the United States.

From 1830 to 1860 was a period when the tariff of the United States was entirely non-protective in its aim and in its scope. I want for a moment, with a very few figures, to show hon. gentlemen that in that particular period the United States had the greatest percentage of growth in its population, and an enormous growth, and I think the greatest percentage growth, in its property values. From 1830 to 1840 the increase for taxation purposes in the property values of the United States was 53 per cent; from 1840 to 1850 an increase of 80 per cent, and from 1850 to 1860 an increase of 126 per cent. I have not the later figures, but my reading leads me to believe that there has been no such percentage of increase in property values after 1860, when high protection was more frankly applied.

In 1800 the United States had a population of 5,308,000; 1830, 12,866,000; 1860, 31,443,000; 1890, 62,947,000; 1920, 105,710,000. Enormous as those last growths of population are, they do not represent as high a percentage in growth as those earlier figures which I quoted, which were given as and for a time when the United States had a tariff for revenue only, and when there was no element of protection in their tariff whatsoever. Thus we see quite clearly that this high protection was not the basis and the nucleus of the great growth of the United States, and therefore that furnishes no lesson at all for Canada.

The United States for every dollar of its total products produced exports only six cents' worth, showing how very largely it relies on its great internal trade, upon its great system of free trade as between state and state. That shows the fallacy of holding up the United States as an example for us to follow in the matter of high protection or even moderate protection.

When we come to our own country, we find that in 1920 our total production was \$4,485,487,785, and in that year our total exports were \$1,189,163,701; in other words, with a population one-twelfth that of the United States, Canada must export and does export about twenty-five cents' worth of every dollar of her total products, in comparison with six cents' worth exported in the United States. In other words, we are four or five