Mr. FIELDING. We have more faith in our manufacturers than my hon. friend.

Mr. AMES. The American steel trust will deal with this as with the other opportunities which the Finance Minister has given them to control the markets of Canada, and I can see no hope of benefit to Canadian interests.

Now, we are sometimes told that there are many benefits from this arrangement. I do not deny that there are some benefits, of course, but I do venture to say that if we had not been so precipitate, we could possibly have got most of these benefits without having made the sacrifices that we have made. The New York 'Journal of Commerce,' an independent paper, commenting on the situation, said the other day:

> The concessions we (the United States) made are in themselves for our benefit, and most if not all of them it would be wise to make if we got nothing in return. The concessions of Canada are also for our benefit as wel as that of the people of Canada.

I think there is little doubt that we would have got the greater portion of these concessions without having to make sacrifices for them. There is a moribund administration at Washington. The new Congress has been elected on a pledge to reduce the tariff all along the line. Would it not have been wiser for us to have waited to see what they would do before we rushed in and gave concessions? Would it not have been wiser also to have waited until after the Imperial Conference? Then we would have been in a position to see how far our neighbours to the south would go of their own initiative, and if it were then necessary to make a limited treaty with them on articles on which they were not prepared themselves to give us freedom of access to their markets, it would have been a right and proper thing to do so. One has only to read the letter of President Taft, which has often been quoted in this House, to see how much the United States realize that they are in need of our raw products. The whole letter teems with expressions to that effect: 'We are exhausting our own, we shall soon need more, we must have those of Canada, let us take this opportunity to secure them.' That is the whole tenor of the letter from beginning to end. And yet our ministers rushed down precipitately and practically gave away our whole hand before the time.

Mr. FIELDING. Will my hon. friend say in what respect we are giving them concessions as respects access to our raw materials?

Mr. AMES. I have shown a good many things that we have sacrificed.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon friend says that we rushed to give away our raw materials to them. Will he show by anv concession that we are proposing to give them any more access to our raw materials than they have to-day?

Mr. AMES. Yes, there are many.

Mr. FIELDING. Mention a few.

Mr. AMES. Wheat, for example. It does not go free.

Mr. FIELDING. Is my hon. friend referring to wheat coming into Canada or wheat going out of Canada?

Mr. AMES. I am referring to wheat going to the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. They are absolutely free to do as they like. It is no concession on our part that makes wheat free into the United States.

Mr. AMES. I will deal with that when I come to it. Now, I want to look at some of these alleged benefits and see what they mean—whether they are all wool and a yard wide and without serious drawbacks. We are told that this arrangement is for the benefit of the Canadian farmer—that he stands to gain by it all along the line, I admit that when the farmer first hears that he is to have access to the American market, he was inclined to favour this arrangement. But when the farmers of this country begin to learn what tags are on what is given to them, they will not be so sure that they want the present which the Finance Minister is offering to them if they have to take all the responsibilities that go with it.

I think it is a self-evident proposition that in a reciprocity agreement between countries which produce similar products, where one country is weaker than the other, the smaller of the two stands to endure the maximum of suffering. The United States and Canada raise identical products, and the United States can raise them cheaper than they can be raised in Canada, although the prices are sometimes higher there than in Canada; but they have the oportunities and the climatic conditions which render it possible for them to raise the raw products cheaper than we in Canada can. They raise wheat and cattle and hogs and dairy products, and we the smaller country stand to suffer the greater loss on a falling market. Even at the present time, notwithstanding the duties, there is more of nearly all agricultural products imported into Canada from the United States than go into the United States from Canada. The Minneapolis 'Journal' gives a list of these—horses, apples, grapes, cherries, cranberries, potatoes, melons, corn, barley, dressed poultry, eggs, dried fruits, and a number of other articles; and the same paper adds:

> Some persons in this country do not appreciate how much we have the best of it in