

In the speech from the throne the first mention is of the bounty of Providence, and we all agree that it is our duty to return thanks for the manner in which Providence has treated this country every year in our history. But in the next sentence we are asked to congratulate the government of the country upon the foreign trade of Canada during the past year. We on this side of the House are always willing to rejoice when there are signs of progress and prosperity in the country, and if the figures having to do with foreign trade reflect a real prosperity, we are prepared to tender our congratulations to the government. But one must really confess that governments have not a great deal to do with such matters. Do the figures as set forth by the Minister of Trade and Commerce only a few days ago demonstrate that we have made any real gain in regard to our foreign trade or the material condition of the people of Canada? What do they show? They show that our trade has grown to the enormous proportions of \$1,291,000,000 of exports and \$991,000,000 of imports. That is a tremendous total, we admit, and I am glad to say it shows that we have a trade balance in our favour of \$300,000,000 odd as between our exports and imports.

Mr. ROBB: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does my hon. friend who says "hear, hear" realize how that favourable trade balance has been secured? Does he realize that in only one single instance have we any favourable trade balance, namely in respect of our trade with Great Britain? Our whole favourable trade balance is made up of our trade with a single country. Exclude all the figures of exports and imports in regard to Great Britain and you find that in respect of your trade with the other nations of the world you have, on the figures submitted by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, an adverse trade balance of \$9,000,000.

If we could feel that those exports amounting to \$1,291,000,000 represented the surplus products of this country after the Canadian market was satisfied, we would all join in congratulations as we would then all participate in the material prosperity which would accrue therefrom to this Dominion. But when we find that those exports do not represent the exportable surplus of our country, but that we have imported into this country to supply our own demands, \$991,000,000 worth of goods, that does not leave very much in our favour, does it? To England we export our agricultural products. We export what is a recurring crop, something we have year by year in larger and larger quantities.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

But our export business with the United States is upon an entirely different basis. They will not take from us our annual recurring agricultural crops which year by year under the bounty of Providence we are able to reap. All they will take from us is the irreplaceable natural assets of this country. The United States are year by year draining us of our natural wealth. They are taking from us our lumber, unmanufactured and partially manufactured, our pulpwood, our pulp, our paper, our mineral assets, our asbestos, our nickel and the like. But they are not taking the products of our farms or our factories. The people of the United States have arranged their tariff on a basis to suit the people of the United States regardless of the people of any other country in the world. We have not done so. We have arranged our fiscal policy to throw our market largely open to the competition of every other country in the world, and the result to-day is that as regards our foreign trade, while we export more than \$1,200,000,000 worth of the goods and products of this country, we have to replace them with the goods of foreign lands to the extent of \$991,000,000, most of which goods could and should be produced in this Dominion.

I am going to call the attention of the House to one or two things that appeared on this trade return and I am glad that my hon. and genial friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is in his place at the moment. I am free to say that there is no more genial, no more entertaining hon. gentleman in this House than the Minister of Agriculture to whom I desire to pay this tribute. I believe he is an agriculturist of very high standing. I believe he is what we know in this country as a scientific agriculturist, and I believe it would be for the benefit of the farmers and the people of Canada generally if my hon. friend would devote himself strictly to scientific agriculture and would leave common, plain matters of business and merchandise to men who seem to know more about it than he does.

I believe the Minister of Agriculture had a good deal to do with the negotiation of those well known trade agreements with Australia and New Zealand. I have heard him pronounce upon those in this chamber time and time again. I have heard him assure the people of Canada that the effect of those agreements would not be to bring the farm products of Australia and New Zealand into competition with the products of the dairy farmers of this country, but the reverse, and he could always demonstrate his position with figures. I ask him to look at the report which his colleague the Minister of Trade and Com-