

The fact is that there is nothing in this world so striking as the exploitation of labour by protection. Will the House allow me to give an example, for this is a strange statement to make. I read recently a book by a member of the Philadelphia bar on the tariff. The evidence is by a cultured and educated American. He tells us, and I can almost repeat it in his own language, how the article borax was sold in the United States of America for \$50 a ton until there was discovered in the United States the richest mine of borax in the world. That mine is situated in California and the neighbouring states. Having discovered this rich mine, the author says a great misfortune fell upon the American people. The discovery of a rich mine should not be a misfortune to a people, but the writer goes on to prove his case. He said that the moment the mine was discovered it needed to be protected, and through the proper influences at Washington, it got protection under the McKinley tariff, 5 cents a pound was put on borax; under the Wilson tariff it fell to 2 cents a pound, and under the Dingley tariff it was put back to 5 cents a pound. A very simple calculation will reveal to the House that that is \$100 a ton, and the price of borax to the American consumer immediately rose to \$150 a ton, while the borax was taken to the coast of the Atlantic and sold to Germany and Britain in competition with the world at \$50 a ton. Oh, but say the protectionists, it is necessary to protect American capital. Unfortunately for that argument, the author says, every cent of the capital working that mine is the capital of a British syndicate. Yes, but the protectionist is not so easily bowled out. What about labour, look at the protection of labour—and this is the point that pertains to the argument which I am contending against, that there is going to be any injury to labour in this reciprocity arrangement. It is a very unfortunate position to be driven to for the protectionist, because my author informs us that the borax is dug out of the mine by Chinese coolies living in shacks. That is a fair example of how labour is protected by this system, and goes far to justify my statement that protection is the greatest exploiter of labour in the world.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had something to say about interprovincial trade. If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery he should feel flattered, because Premier Roblin yesterday repeated most of what he said, in the Manitoba House, and the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) dealt liberally with him in the same fashion. I wish to cite a few figures in this connection. In my opinion the hon. member for North Toronto was on very, very weak ground when he spoke lightly of the importance of

foreign trade. I do not think I misrepresent him, I am sure I do not desire to, when I say he spoke lightly of foreign trade. I think it is capable of exact proof that there is no surer test of the greatness of a nation than its foreign trade. If I were to ask any hon. member on either side what are the four greatest nations in the world I should get the same answer from every one of them, the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany and France, perhaps in a different order of preference; if I did not happen to be a modest man, I might have put Great Britain first. That would be the universal consensus of thinking men anywhere. Yes, Sir, but these four nations are also at the head of the foreign trade of the world. I take it that this is almost a proof that you can have no better test of the greatness of a people than by its foreign trade, and no better test of the rapidity with which it is marching to greatness than by the way it is expanding its foreign commerce, and it is a matter of congratulation to us on both sides of the House that Canada is the country that is making the most rapid advances in this direction.

The next proposition I should like to lay down in regard to what fell from my hon. friend on interprovincial trade is that there is no real quarrel between interprovincial trade and foreign trade; on the contrary they advance, in my judgment, *pari passu*. Does the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) think there is no interprovincial trade in Germany or in Great Britain or in France? Does he not know that there is interstate trade, but that these nations also have the greatest foreign trade in the world? There is no quarrel between interprovincial trade and foreign trade.

I wish to offer an illustration upon that point. In 1893, an interesting year, three years before the change of government, the foreign trade of Canada was \$247,000,000 all told, export and import. That was when my hon. friends were building a nation under the National Policy, and when the finances of this country were under the guidance of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In the year 1894, the year after that, the foreign trade and commerce had dropped from \$247,000,000 to \$240,000,000, and in the year 1895, the figures had dropped still further to \$224,000,000. I should like to ask any candid hon. gentleman on the other side of the House whether Canada at that time, when her foreign trade was not only insignificant but diminishing, had an interprovincial trade that was anything to boast about? There was no west for the east to trade with. Talk of the prosperity of Canada having a growth of 40 years. I have not been in Canada 40 years, I have not been here since 1896—