

adian treasury. In 1910 Canada marketed in the United States forty million dollars' worth of natural products on which we paid into Uncle Sam's treasury no less a sum than three and a-half million dollars. The proposed arrangement simply meant that if next year we sold forty million dollars' worth of natural products in the United States we would not have to pay into Uncle Sam's treasury a single dollar, and yet the Minister of Finance tells us that because Canadian products can go to the United States without Canadians paying tribute to the United States' treasury, forsooth that may bring on entanglements. I shall later on state what the people in the Old Land had to say about entanglements, but meantime the Minister of Finance should bear in mind that that statement of his instead of being considered a progressive policy for his government is rather what I would call a fly policy, because we know that flies are caught on tanglefoot made in the United States. I cannot understand the dread of the Minister of Finance with regard to entanglements, because the fisherman who lives on the Canadian side of the lake can market his fish in Cleveland without paying duty.

I wonder if the hon. gentleman saw a cartoon in one of the daily papers a short time ago. That cartoon represented an automobile with two gentlemen in its back seat. One had the Stars and Stripes around his hat and the other the Union Jack. The one represented the great American republic and the other the motherland, and beneath the cartoon was this phrase: 'Another passenger wanting to get on.' What did that mean? It meant that President Taft, and the representative of the United Kingdom were riding in the same carriage and that the President of the French republic wished to get on board and keep company with them, and bring his country into the agreement. Just think of it. Under this great masterpiece of policy inaugurated by the present government of the United States, American and Canadian neighbours living along a 4,000 mile border could trade together in natural products without paying any customs duty, had that policy not been rejected by the Canadian people.

Then the hon. gentleman spoke of the danger to our transportation companies which would result from that policy. He said:—

What, I ask, is to be said of a policy that would divert the wheat of the west to the American roads and the other vigilant competitors referred to in the speech of the right hon. gentleman?

The hon. the Finance Minister seemed to apprehend that our western wheat would be brought to Minneapolis and there ground into flour and shipped to Europe. But I

would like to ask him what is there to hinder that being done to-day? The hon. gentleman drew the presumption that if the duty were taken off wheat, that remission of duty would have the effect of diverting our Canadian wheat south of the line, and transporting it to European markets through American channels. But what is the position to-day: the hon. gentleman knows that if he had ten cars of wheat, there is nothing to prevent his shipping it to Minneapolis and there having that wheat ground into flour and thence exported to the United Kingdom.

He would pay the duty of 25 cents per bushel, but when it was exported 99 per cent of the duty would be refunded. So that to-day Canadian wheat ground at Minneapolis when exported is practically free of duty.

There is no duty on wheat exported from Canada via the United States. That wheat goes through in bond. Why then does our wheat not go through American channels to-day? Why does it not take the southern route over American railways and thence to Europe? I would suggest to the hon. the Finance Minister that he might perhaps read with profit what the great chief who leads the Liberal party said on that point when the reciprocity pact was under discussion in this House. He would then discover that the reason why our western wheat does not go south to-day is because Canada furnishes the shortest and best route to the old land and not because of the rejection of the reciprocity pact at all. Our wheat can reach the seaboard through Canadian channels much easier and with less mileage than over the American railways.

Then it is only fair to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to this further fact. We ought not to forget that the day is coming when we shall have a very large surplus to export and will have to look for other markets. To-day the United States have only two-thirds of a bushel per capita of wheat to export, whereas Canada, with only a small portion of her land under cultivation, has 16 bushels per capita to export, so that the time is near at hand when the United States will not have any wheat to export but will have to import wheat for home consumption, and it will be a happy day when Canada can have the United States market free of duty for natural products.

I do not wish to transgress on the time of the House but I would like to say a word with reference to another statement of the Minister of Finance. Speaking of the effect of the elections, he said that the rejection of the reciprocity agreement was the best advertisement Canada ever received in Great Britain. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman meant by those words, but I would point out that the present policy of the motherland is