

And fresh and smoked meats are also in the list of the things affected. In my own district, as I have explained before, we have an area 650 miles by 350, and the people are making a start now in the raising of sheep. But what will happen when we allow the cheap mutton that comes from Australia to enter into competition with our product? And remember that mutton is only a by-product in Australia; it cuts no ice at all with the sheep raiser, whereas in British Columbia it is vital to the sheep industry. He must get a fair price for his mutton in order to make the industry profitable. Sheep-raising is the best paying industry in my constituency to-day. True, it is only being carried on in a small way at present, but the industry is going to grow rapidly because it is profitable. After all, the farmer is a pretty wise man, and when he sees that a particular branch of agriculture is profitable he is going to take a crack at it. But I am afraid the government will come along and with another trade treaty ruin the small sheep-raiser. Remember, we need plenty of wool in this country. In the name of common sense—if this government had any, which I doubt,—why should it put into operation a treaty that would bear so harshly on some of the most deserving classes in this country?

Now, one of my friends opposite asked me something about the meaning of an adequate tariff. Apparently he did not understand the term. I hope to enlighten him before I am through. During the general election our Liberal friends tried to terrify the people by telling them that the Conservative party advocated a high tariff. But we do not want to talk about high tariff, adequate tariff, low tariff or free trade. What we want to talk about is equivalent tariffs—equivalent protection—nothing else. I went to the trouble of looking up the definition of "equivalent" I do not see my note here, but I can tell the House what the word means.

An hon. MEMBER: Brick for brick.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. FRASER: Maybe hon. members will take it as read. My recollection of the definition of "equivalent" as I copied it from Webster's new international dictionary is: equal in value, force or import. Equal in value—that is what we want in our tariff policy. We want such a tariff policy as will give the same value to the Canadian as the Australian demands for himself. What this country needs is equivalent tariffs, equivalent protection, up and down the whole tariff line. The question should be studied care-

[Mr. Fraser.]

fully and thoroughly by men who have a sympathetic interest in it, and a policy founded on their conclusions should be put into operation by a government that has some back bone and some sense. I have just placed my hand on what I copied from Webster's dictionary. Equivalent means: Equal in worth or value, force, power—

An hon. MEMBER: That is nothing new.

Mr. FRASER: Well, some other hon. members might be enlightened if I read the full definition:

Equivalent: Equal in worth or value, force, power, effect, import and the like; alike in significance and value; of the same import or meaning.

That is what I submit we need in this country—tariffs that are of the same import or meaning, alike in significance and value. We want them to apply in a fair and reasonable way. We do not want them to apply for the benefit of the manufacturing interests alone. What we are particularly interested in at present is the agricultural industry—the primary and basic industry of this country. I maintain that our agricultural industry in every line is being unfairly treated by this government, it is being robbed.

In the Speech from the Throne I notice this declaration: My government proposes to proceed forthwith with the completion of the Hudson Bay railway. Why does the government in the Speech from the Throne specify the completion of a common, ordinary public work? To me such a statement is entirely out of place in a Speech from the Throne. It is not dignified to so specify the completion of a public work. I may say here that my people in Prince George want a post office. Next session are we to find a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne saying: We propose forthwith to construct a post office in Prince George? I see my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) smiling. I have made application to him for that post office, and I hope he will not forget to include it in the estimates. Now, I contend that the completion of a public work should not be mentioned in the Speech from the Throne at all. It is not a declaration of public policy. On the contrary, it is a sign of weakness. The rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, clearly intimate to me that I must not talk about "purchasing" independent votes in this House; but I do not know what that passage in the Speech from the Throne is if it is not an offer for support or something of that kind from the independent members in this House. It looks like that to me at any rate, because on the very face of it it is not a subject that should be introduced into such a document.