

amongst the Allies. But we have had talk about preferential trade within the Empire for many a long day. For one, I hope I shall never live to see the day when the good relations between Great Britain and Canada will be hampered by any written agreement or any preferential trade. The farmers of the West, the men who it is supposed, will benefit most by preferential trade within the Empire, have declared time and again that they do not want preferential trade, they do not want an increased price for their wheat which will mean that the labouring masses of Great Britain will pay more for their bread. I hope the present relations will always exist, Great Britain being left free to do what she likes with her tariff and Canada free to do what she likes with hers, the cordiality of inter-Imperial relations being left wholly unhampered by any written or hard-and-fast agreement.

My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, (Sir Herbert Ames) made one very peculiar statement. If I understood him, he said that if the reciprocity pact had passed in 1911 our tariff arrangements would be made at Washington instead of at Ottawa. Then, what does he think of the Minister of Finance who adopts exactly that policy to-day? Has the minister transferred the making of the Canadian tariff from Ottawa to Washington?

Sir HERBERT AMES: I endeavoured to make as clear as I could the point that under this arrangement of free wheat we had not in the slightest degree impaired our control of our own tariff.

Mr. TURRIFF: Under the reciprocity pact it was left open to either side to bring the arrangement to an end at any time. It is true that in this case of free wheat—and I will take up that subject more directly later on—the Government have so provided that they can bring the arrangement to an end even without appealing to Parliament. So they can use the free wheat argument as a vote-catcher for three or four months, while at the same time they can tell their friends in the East, the millers and the railroads, that it is only a temporary war measure which can be cancelled by Order in Council. But in fact they can do more even than that—they need not even pass an Order in Council. The matter has been looked into, and it is clear that the moment the war stops free trade in wheat under the present Order in Council comes to an end.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who told you that?

Mr. TURRIFF: A better lawyer than my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen)—or rather, as I do not wish to say anything objectionable, a lawyer in whose opinion I should have much more confidence than in that of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read the opinion of that lawyer.

Mr. TURRIFF: The hon. gentleman will get all the legal opinion he wants before this debate is finished. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, says that by putting wheat on the free list we are not following the example of 1911. But let my hon. friend consider the facts. In 1915 the wheat crop of Canada amounted to 370,000,000 bushels. That quantity of wheat at the price ruling to-day—say \$2.25 a bushel—would represent one-third of the total export and import trade of Canada of which the minister boasted, and which certainly was something to boast about. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, would have us believe that the effect of the reciprocity agreement of 1911 would have been to put the making of the Canadian tariff in the power of Washington, but that putting wheat on the free list, though that crop alone might easily amount to one-third of our total trade, has nothing whatever to do with giving Washington any control in our tariff affairs. The two stories do not hang together.

The same hon. gentleman had something to say about the wonderful economy of this Government, and held it to be a matter of pride that the Minister of Finance was able to announce that \$60,000,000 would be left to apply in paying for the war. Well, it seems to me that at this time, when we are having great business success, when we are taking in over a million dollars a day paid by Great Britain and our Allies for war munitions, and when a large part of that money is profit, surely this is the time when we ought to pay, not \$60,000,000, but double that amount on account of the war. Had this Government practised reasonable economy during the years they have been in office, they would be able to pay towards the expense of the war more than twice what they are paying. And why not? Why should not we follow the example of Great Britain where, as pointed out by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) they raised one hundred and fifty per cent more revenue by direct taxation than had