

them a single article which would come within the scope of the agreement. In Norway and Sweden our exports were \$487,120 and our imports \$100,000, and amongst these there are some fish, and Norway would have the benefit of free fish under this agreement and that is the first item on that which is at all affected. Then, we have some trade with Japan, but does any one imagine that Japan will send us wheat or flax or cereals? With Denmark we had some trade, but not very extensive, our exports being \$125,000 and our imports \$40,000, and while Denmark is a better exporting country not a pound of butter came to Canada from Denmark. Then, with the State of Columbia our exports were \$42,000 and our imports \$28,000, but they included nothing mentioned in the arrangement. Bolivia—we have not any trade with it, we do not import anything from it or export anything to it. Austria-Hungary—our imports are \$1,410,000 and our exports \$60,000, the imports are chiefly lace and things of that kind. Then I come to the last, the Argentine Republic, our total exports are \$2,909,000, and our total imports \$2,161,000; and I find that we have not imported from the Argentine a single article that is included in this agreement. The Argentine, however, is a wheat-growing country, and it exports wheat, but if ever the Argentine Republic sends wheat to Canada, there is no reason why Canada should not send wheat to the Argentine, so that objection is wholly exploded and may be dismissed without further reference.

Another objection which has been taken in this agreement is that it will destroy our natural resources. My hon. friend from North Toronto was particularly malignant on this point. He grew eloquent and asked us what we meant by establishing a Conservation Commission for the preservation of our natural resources and then proceeding with ruthless hands to destroy their work. I have to say to my hon. friend that the Commission for the preservation of our natural resources was intended to deal not at all with questions of political economy, but with questions of physical science. My hon. friend told us that we should preserve our natural resources for our children and for our children's children; but I ask my hon. friend, what is the object of these natural resources? Soil, water, forests, minerals, have been given to man by the Creator for the use of man, and all civilized nations have acted accordingly. Why did our ancestors leave their respective lands and come to this country and take it from the Indians if it was not for the purpose of taking hold of the natural resources of the country and using them for their benefit? The Indians were men after the heart of my hon. friend from North Toronto—they were great preservers of natural resources. They

kept them not for themselves but for their children and the children of their children. They never used them in any great extent. The Indians they inhabited contained many minerals, but when our ancestors came here they found the Indians using implements made of bone and stone. They never cultivated the soil, they lived on fish and game. They were in the midst of immense forests, but they never felled a tree to build a house. They lived beside the most noble streams in the world but they did not use them to turn a wheel, they never even used water to wash. They were people after the heart of my hon. friend from North Toronto. Our ancestors who came here came to enjoy the natural resources of the land. Unfortunately they not only used, but also abused them. It is the reproach of the white settler that if he has used these natural resources, he has been imprudent, and has destroyed them much more wantonly than he has consumed them for his own benefit. It is charged to-day against the Canadian farmer that he is not cultivating the soil, but mining it, and taking all the fertility out of it. It is charged against the Canadian lumberman that he is not only cropping the timber, as he should, but in his operations, is destroying much more than he uses. I think it is admitted that in this valley of the Ottawa, where timber has been cut for the last one hundred years, the lumbermen have destroyed more timber than they have ever carried away. Sir, the object of the Conservation Commission is simply to instruct the farmers, the lumbermen, and others, how to use the natural resources of the country. But if that be the case, the Commission, which is ably presided over by my hon. friend from Brandon, will do an immense service in showing all our people how to use these resources with prudence, so that they will be preserved for our children and our children's children.

But, Sir, what has this to do with this agreement? My hon. friend says that our resources will be taken by the Americans. Well, the Americans will take them if they pay for them; but whether they take them or not, whether this agreement goes into force or not, the natural resources of the country will be made use of, and I hope in a more prudent manner than they are at the present time. My hon. friend from North Toronto need have no further apprehension on that point.

I pass to a more important objection, really the only objection of any consequence that I know of. The objection is that this agreement will imperil our industries. How will it imperil our industries? This agreement is concerned chiefly with natural products. There are no manufactured products dealt with in it, except agricultural implements. In negotiating this agreement we