

delivered after the repeal of the corn laws, drew attention to the fact that the most notable thing after the repeal of those laws was the improvement of agriculture in Great Britain. We know what is sure to happen if a man is held up on his feet: he will never develop the muscles of his lower limbs. The same is true when a state undertakes to support farming industry. There are numbers of men in this House, who have attained their present position by their own character and efforts, and who know that men grow stronger by reliance on themselves, and that manufacturing and farming grow strong in the same way. There is not a fact in the history of commerce to show that intensive farming was ever helped by protection. In free trade Britain to-day—if I am wrong, the Minister of Agriculture will correct me—33 bushels of wheat to the acre are grown on the average; in protected America the average is 14 bushels to the acre, and in Canada, with our virgin soil, it is only 17 bushels. What is the matter, I ask my protectionist friends, with little Britain as a country where intensive farming is carried on under free trade?

My hon. friend went on next to say that the policy of mutual preference had been destroyed by this reciprocity arrangement. That was a somewhat sad confession on his part. I think he said that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister had dished preference. Well, that was extraordinary adulation. We on this side of the House are sometimes deemed servile for serving up adulation to my right hon. friend, but he never had such a dish of adulation served up to him on this side of the House. We never charged him with running both Canada and Great Britain at the same time. It was the more extraordinary phrase coming from the hon. member for North Toronto, because in another part of the same speech he had referred to my right hon. friend as a very ordinary man, while he was furnishing evidence that he was a very extraordinary man. However, I am quite sure that my hon. friend would not claim that for himself. The great thing for me is his admission that British preference is dished. I think there is no doubt about that fact, but I do not agree with his charge that it has been dished by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. We on this side of the House, as I believe all the people of Canada, are reasonably proud that we have for Prime Minister of this country a man whose opinion goes for a great deal in Great Britain, but neither he nor we would claim that he is the author of what my hon. friend from North Toronto must consider such a terrible misfortune. This mutual preference is a preference which meant a movement on the part of Great Britain towards restricted trade, whereas the Fielding preference was a movement

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer).

towards freer trade on the part of Canada—two very different things economically considered. It must have been with a very sad heart that my hon. friend discovered that this infant of mutual preference, into which he had tried to breathe the breath of life for years, was not an infant at all, but only a wax doll. The hon. member for North Toronto said in this House in 1892, as recorded in 'Hansard':

If I read public opinion in the old country aright, I believe that the free trade sentiment pure and simple, founded on what were thought to be irrefutable principles almost divine in origin, is largely changing in Great Britain.

Well, some men need a long time for the fulfilment of their prophecies. I am not sure that my hon. friend feels that there is so much change in that direction in Great Britain at the present time. It could reasonably be argued that if the principles are true, they are of divine origin. That may be the reason they are not recognized by my hon. friend. I have often been afraid that he looked in another direction for his economic inspiration. Even if I did not admit that the policy of protection is bad enough to come from a direction opposite to the divine, I would certainly admit that it is an intensely human thing to say the least of it.

At six o'clock committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Chairman, I quoted some figures, in illustration of an argument which I ventured to present to the committee at the very beginning of my remarks, from a speech which I had read in the Winnipeg 'Tribune,' as made by a governor of an American state. I quoted these figures from memory. But, on examining critically, it is clear I must have been in error as to the quantity of nails procured at a certain price. It is perfectly immaterial to the argument which I was presenting. It does not need figures to prove that goods are sold cheaper in Great Britain and other protected countries. It certainly does not need figures to prove that to protectionists, because they are continually taunting Great Britain with being the dumping ground of cheap goods. I mention the matter only because it is desirable to be accurate even in small things, and not because it affects the argument I was presenting in that connection.

When the committee adjourned at six o'clock, Sir, I was trying to answer the question: What dished preference? And I set out to show that preference in the sense of the Chamberlain preference was never likely to live if it depended in any degree