

richest of our population, so far as the tariff is concerned. An ingenious friend of mine told me to-day that if Mr. John D. Rockefeller should come to this country now, the poorest man in Canada with a large family would pay more federal taxes than Mr. Rockefeller would, in spite of the Minister of Finance's business tax, because the Rockefeller wealth is held individually and not through corporations. I give that statement for what it may be worth, but there is a great deal of truth in it anyhow, and it is a curious commentary upon the statement I have made, which statement is capable of the most direct proof. And the custom of raising revenues by a tariff has so seared the consciences of men that in the United States it was the custom to put a higher tax on the rough goods used by the poor than upon the fine goods used by the rich. That was the moral effect of the tariff, until the people grew so disgusted with it that they turned to a president with sense enough to lead them away from it, as President Wilson has been doing.

My third principle—and let me say there is a correlation, a distinct logical connection, between these principles which I am trying to bring before House in the most serious spirit—is that, we must maintain the foreign commerce of the country, and extend it. I think I can prove this from the minister's speech, brief as it was. He told us of the amazing prosperity that we were now enjoying, which contrasts very much with the conditions in Canada just before the war broke out. And in the next breath he told us that our foreign commerce had expanded in a way that no man would have believed possible a few years ago. Here we have two things—prosperity; foreign commerce. Of course, the hon. minister knows, and was perfectly candid in admitting, that the foreign commerce we are doing at the present time is largely artificial. Owing to no fault of our own, owing to circumstances in our conduct which will rebound to the eternal credit of Canada, we are at war. We are obliged to borrow hugely because we are at war. We are at war in the best of causes, fighting for civilization and liberty. But Canada, though she is righteously at war, bears a striking resemblance financially to the man who has become hard-up and goes to borrow from a Jew.

He gets \$50 or \$100 and he signs a paper by which for the \$100 he promises to pay in three months, shall we say, if he is a decent kind of a Jew, \$112—pretty good interest—

but it is only a decent Jew who would charge \$12 for a \$100 advance for three months. The man who gets into that unfortunate position is all right as long as the \$100 lasts. One hundred dollars will carry him any way for a few days of the three months but £100 would probably be better for the whole period. But, if he gets through his £100, or his \$100, at the end of two months the third month of the period is a pretty bad one for him and he is wondering where he will get the \$112 to pay back the money he has borrowed. That is the position of Canada to-day, financially, not morally, and our trade is largely the result of that position. We are borrowing and are doing a trade that is absolutely artificial, that is promoted by the exigencies of war and that is not as big an increase in trade as it looks because of the rise in prices. It is very clear that if I were selling three hogs before the war for \$10 apiece, and I am selling two now for \$20 apiece, I am doing a trade which will look better in the value column but is not as good in the production column and certainly does not look as good on the breakfast table because, whatever our fiscal prejudices may be, most of us will admit that three hogs will feed more people than two. Our trade is artificially promoted by the exigencies of war.

But, is there not vast instruction, and needed instruction, along the lines which have been debated in this House ever since Confederation? Why, Sir, we are told that you need a tariff, and a long period of protection, to raise industries, to promote commerce and to create prosperity. Last year the United States created a record for all nations and all times up to the present in the financial value of her exports. She exported three billion dollars worth of goods. She was all the better able to do that because she had been gradually freeing her commerce under a fiscally enlightened president. Canada's figures as given to-day are simply marvellous. If we had exports comparable with our imports the exports must be marvellous. But, I venture to give the House a figure that is possibly more marvellous; before last year the record for export trade for all time was held by Great Britain and Ireland. There were two billion dollars worth of exports and that figure was reached in time of peace and not owing to the exigencies of war at all. How was that figure reached?—by promotion of foreign commerce. Two billion dollars' worth of exports from