

BRITISH TRADE AND IMPERIAL RECIPROCITY.

BY ALEXANDER MCNEILL, M.P.

A CLEAR Government majority of 52 against a total Opposition vote of 64 is a striking record. It is especially so at the present time, and in reference to a motion introduced by a man of Mr. McCarthy's standing and conspicuous ability. There is, I think, almost a consensus of opinion among members that no man within its walls can present his case to the House of Commons with the concentrated penetrative force possessed by the member for North Simcoe. Yet his attempt to induce representatives of the people to condemn the policy of protection to native industries has been no more successful than the vote of Friday morning indicates. It is mere childishness, in this case, to talk about the influence of that much-used and much-abused political weapon, the party Whip. That, of course, cracked its loudest on both sides of the House. But it is very well known that men voted with the Government against Mr. McCarthy's resolution, who have not hesitated to oppose the Government on former occasions—even so recently as during the present session of Parliament—and who are much more likely to be driven out of line than into line by an attempt at party coercion. The result, then, is very significant. It is clear proof that the sober sense of the representatives of the Canadian people revolts at the proposal to tear up the fiscal policy of the country, endanger her industries, and imperil her credit, in order to try an experiment that has never yet succeeded. Every country in the civilized world that has built up its manufacturing industries has done so under a protective policy. It should never be forgotten that, when England threw open her markets to the world, she did

so without risk to her manufactures from foreign competition, as the nations of continental Europe and the United States of America were mainly dependent upon her for the goods she manufactured. No danger threatened from those quarters. Free imports for her, then, meant only free imports of food stuffs and raw material. Free imports of these meant the cheapening of production, and this, in its turn, meant more extensive sales and better employment for her mechanics; and all went merry as a marriage bell. "All?" No, not all; not the agricultural interest. It was sacrificed. But then so long as it could be made to appear that the sufferers were only landlords, what did it matter? That fallacy, however, has pretty well run its allotted course, and will not deceive anyone much longer.

Steam power and free imports worked shoulder to shoulder in building up England's vast manufacturing industries, and distributing their products the world over. England dominated all markets. The statesmen of Europe and America saw, and took their measures accordingly. They met her policy of free imports by a policy of protection. They refused to permit her to pursue a system of free trade—they refused to give her free sale for her wares. Under a system of protection, they built up manufactures of their own, and, after a time, were able not only to supply their own people with goods of home manufacture, but, to some extent, to compete with England in neutral markets. To-day England's open market means, not as at first it did—a market open to foods and raw material only. It means also a slaughter market for the surplus of the manufactured products