

in the savings bank being an indication of the prosperity of the country is concerned. It simply indicates that in many instances the state of the country is such that no other kind of investment is profitable.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—It has no bearing whatever on our case. I am very glad to hear that my countrymen had so much money to deposit.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I would not refer to the question of savings bank deposits at all, but having heard it spoken of so very often as being a matter of proof of the prosperity of the country, I thought it was only fair to make a passing reference to it. Having got through that branch of the subject which had reference mainly to the savings bank argument, and having referred to the relations of trade with the prosperity of different countries, I beg leave to make some reference to the opinions of prominent men upon this question: because, while one hon. gentleman may express one opinion, and another hon. gentleman may express another opinion, very little result comes from it, as we may be more or less moved by our political antecedents, or by our political proclivities, or by other considerations; but the opinions of distinguished men, who are not influenced by any personal or party considerations, ought to have some weight. I would not refer to this branch of the subject if it had not been that previous speakers have made similar references, and therefore I am sure the House will excuse me if I quote from the remarks of some gentlemen of distinction. In doing this, I do not intend to refer to such writers as Adam Smith, or to great reformers like Cobden, Bright or Gladstone, or to such a great authority as Beaconsfield. All of them had very strong views on this question of free trade.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Beaconsfield was not a free trader.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I will not refer to remarks of prominent politicians in the United States, although my hon. friend from Niagara thinks that the intelligence of the public men of the neighboring republic is of a higher order than that of the public men of England, and their

opinions would no doubt be listened to with more attention than the opinions of the British statesmen whose names I have mentioned. It is not necessary perhaps to refer to such prominent men as President Cleveland or Mr. Wells, who have written so much on this great question, and whose opinions are so well known; but there is one gentleman to whom reference has been made in the debate—Sir A. T. Galt—I wish to refer to a speech which he delivered some years ago to the merchants of Toronto.

HON. MR. READ—He has changed his opinions since then.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—In that speech Sir A. T. Galt said:—

If we are to succeed in getting immigrants into Canada, we must not lose sight of the fact that it must be made attractive to them. It must be a cheap country; immigrants must not find that it is as dear as other countries, which perhaps offer more advantages. That leads me to a consideration of the question of the high duties on imports. High rates have unquestionably made the United States a dear country, and Canada is a comparatively cheap country because of its moderate duties, which afford perhaps the most direct compensation for the natural advantages which the adjoining Republic possesses over the Dominion. (Hear) I do not believe there is any advantage whatever in the doctrine of extreme protection. (Renewed applause.) I do not believe it is possible to develop manufactures on any large scale by high duties. Our market is too limited, we have only four millions of people to supply, and it must be perfectly clear that the result of high duties would be to create an artificial industry which does not rest on its own intrinsic merit. It is to be observed that protection—high duties—enhance the cost of every other article, as well as that in which a particular manufacturer may be interested. It renders it more expensive for every manufacturer to manufacture his goods. If everything the boot and shoe maker uses is protected by high duties it is evident that his goods must be dearer. The result would consequently be that the exportation of our surplus goods to foreign countries would become absolutely impossible. We cannot have an export trade if the goods are artificially made dear in this country. We have in the United States a most complete example of that. That is a country which ought to be the cheapest country in the world, which has the largest amount of available land and every material advantage, and yet by a wrong system of legislation and economic policy the people have succeeded for many years past in making it one of the

HON. MR. McCLELAN,