

freight rates to haul over three ranges of mountains when they have only to pay ocean carriage from Australia or New Zealand to Vancouver.

Taking the question by and large, it seems to me that natural products will become cheaper at the ocean ports and for a certain distance inland. They will be lower in winter. They may possibly be higher in summer, owing to the opportunity afforded our farmers for sending them to the United States. But our farmer, on the whole, will be worse off than before, because he will have to sell his winter product at Antipodean prices, and will have to stand the chance of bad times and of Canada being made a dumping ground for the American surplus.

There was another phrase of this question that I was going to allude to. It had been my intention in this House to move a resolution in favour of reciprocal trade arrangements with Australia. I had made some careful preparation in that direction, and had interviewed some of the Australian ministers, and having brought the correspondence down, it seemed to me that a discussion of this question would be a useful one in the House. But there is no use now in bringing up the question of Canadian-Australian reciprocal trade arrangements. The whole hand of the government is on the table, the game is played. All those items which we want, all those commodities which we could fairly send to them, we cannot now send without the intermixture of American goods. Nearly all the items on which we were prepared to make concessions to Australia, are now free. We are henceforth handicapped both in giving to them and taking from them, because we have no longer a basis or means of negotiation. Let me put on 'Hansard' this schedule, and you will see what I mean. Australia could export to Canada:

	Formerly.	Now.
Meats.. . . .	3c. lb.	1½c.
Canned meats.. . . .	27½ p.c.	20 p.c.
Mutton and lamb.. . . .	3c.	1½c.
Poultry.. . . .	25 p.c.	free.
Tallow.. . . .	20 p.c.	5 p.c.
Butter.. . . .	4c. lb.	free.
Apples.. . . .	40c. brl.	free.
Grapes.. . . .	2c. lb.	free.
Oranges.. . . .	free.	free.
Peaches	\$1 per 100 lbs.	free.
Salt and a few others	5c. per 100 lbs.	free.

On the other hand, the articles we can export to Australia from the Pacific coast are limited to lumber, fish and fruit. Our people in British Columbia were expecting to get a great market opened to them. Now, lumber, fish and fruit are all free, and no distinction is possible between Canada and the United States, and it is impossible for us to get any preference in their market. Consequently, the whole game is played.

Then, under these most-favoured-nation treaty arrangements, there are many other countries we have to consider, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Russia, Spain, Switzerland and many others. Norway and Sweden export bacon, salt pork and butter, condensed milk, salt and pickled fish. Denmark exports butter, bacon and salted meats, eggs and potatoes. In 1909 Denmark exported eggs of the value of \$8,250,000. Russia exports eggs, and Siberia exports butter. Spain exports grapes and dried fruits. These countries can now get their goods into Canada without our giving anything in exchange; in other words, we have practically instituted free trade in natural products with all the world, and the cheapest producer of all the competitors will set the pace for the rest. If the Italian, the German or the Spaniard can live on less than the farmer in Canada, the Canadian farmer will have to come down to his level; there is no other alternative.

Now let me come to the last phase of my argument and inquire whether there is not a better way for Canada to progress and develop than the way the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have chosen on our behalf. Speaking generally, it seems to me that it is bad policy for a nation to send its raw material out of the country. It was by a strict adherence to that policy, that the German Empire has prospered so greatly, that France has prospered, and that England has prospered and is prospering to-day. Our natural resources represent potential employment, wealth and prosperity. They spell towns, and railways, and industrial establishments, when they are worked up in the country. What we cannot utilize ourselves, we are in duty bound, I think, to hold in trust for those who come after us. To export our raw materials, and to enable the stranger to grow rich in working up our materials, is to draw upon our national capital from the bank, and to present it to outsiders. What would you think of a manufacturer, a shoe manufacturer, for example, who, having bought sole leather at 20 cents a pound, and finding it was worth 22 cents a pound, should forthwith, sell his supply, and close his factory? You would speak of him as bereft of his senses, and yet that is exactly what is meant by the proposition we are now contending against. I have always cherished the idea for Canada that she should become a highly developed and self-contained country, but this legislation seriously endangers that ideal. It is to my mind, the duty of each one to have regard to the welfare of all, for only thus can a common nationality be upbuilt. Now I contend that there is a better way to build up Canada, than the one that has been proposed by the negotiators, and let me illustrate it by way of analyses. Suppose that