

I am very glad I came after 1896—but I can read the story of simple and plain figures and the simple and plain figures teach me what I wish to present with all respect to my hon. friend that when the foreign trade was insignificant and diminishing the interprovincial trade was small too.

But, this is not a matter of figures and of theories only, is it not a matter of common sense? What is the object of Canada in all of her policies at the present time? What is the object of her immigration policy; what is the object of her transportation policy—the one object is to get a huge surplus of wealth from out of the land, the great heritage which the Almighty has given us. And surely when we get that surplus it is common sense to know that we must and can only dispose of it by foreign trade. Allied to this argument is what my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) said about the frightening of capital; he told us Britain's capital is going to be frightened from Canadian investment. Well, I cannot think so. I received a letter yesterday telling me that two acquaintances of mine in the north of England, and their wives are coming here in May, and they have considerable capital; they are not frightened; I talked with a young Northumbrian the other night who told me he had a letter from a young man who was sailing in the month of March to Canada, and as they are somewhat politicians in Northumberland, this young man who is coming out wrote congratulating my friend (who is one of the free-traders so scarce in this country according to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on the fact that he was living in Canada, where the fiscal policy was approximating to the fiscal policy of Great Britain. I would like to ask my hon. friend whether he thinks the financiers of Great Britain will be really frightened to embark their capital in an atmosphere of freer trade when they know very well they made all of that capital in an atmosphere of absolute free trade. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) also said that this policy was inimical to our industries, and as the hon. gentleman has been courteous enough to come into the chamber I ought perhaps to tell him that I heard every word of his speech but I excuse myself from the double task of both hearing it and reading it on the ground that life is somewhat brief. I shall endeavour, from the notes I took as I heard it, to state fairly his position. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said that this trade arrangement was inimical to the building up of the industries of Canada. We hear that outcry from various quarters and I must say it is rather a curious outcry considering the source it comes from, for were I a manufacturer I should have lain as low as 'brer rabbit' at this particular moment. What

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer).

does the outcry from that particular quarter mean; what is making them cry out? Personally, I would have made them cry a good deal harder if that were possible. They cried hard enough in 1897—industries were paralyzed and destroyed then according to them, and I do not know that we can do much more to a thing than first to paralyze and then destroy it. But no disaster happened to them then, and somehow or other I do not feel it is going to happen to them now. To be serious upon this point, I do think that the great moneyed interests do not live up to their responsibilities when they oppose thus lightly what I believe to be a policy that is supported by the great masses of the people of this country. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition seemed to lend himself to this argument: That the policy of reciprocity and of freer trade is inimical to the building up of industries, and I must say that in this respect he did not follow his usual custom of carefully buttressing his position by facts. The hon. gentleman said twice over in a somewhat demonstrative way, that the United States was the greatest manufacturing country in the world. Well, I should not make superlative statements about anything unless I were prepared to offer some evidence. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) did for once stoop to figures at this point, and he seemed to think it was a wonderful thing to turn to his followers and say: Why the United States of America exported \$440,000,000 worth of manufactured goods last year. Well, they live on a continent and they have 90,000,000 of inhabitants, and they have protection thrown in to help them. I was reared in a small country, the country of Britain, and I am sure my hon. friends opposite who are the British party will be glad to hear what Britain has done. You could put the United Kingdom twice over into the province of Alberta so that her area is somewhat restricted for carrying on her operations, and she only has 45,000,000 people as against 95,000,000 in the United States, and my hon. friend thinks that \$440,000,000 worth of manufactured goods is a wonderful record under protection. Well, I think it is, but free trade is a different matter. What does he think the exports of manufactured goods from Great Britain were last year, exclusive of ships—£334,000,000 sterling worth. If you multiply that by five you will get somewhere around \$1,670,000,000 worth of manufactured goods from a little country which is having imports dumped on it from all the world, and which according to all protectionist theories ought to have had its manufacturing industries destroyed off the face of the earth. There has been some talk of an expert tariff commission upon how industries are built up, and if I may trespass on the time of the House, I should like to give a little expert testi-