

raw material. If as raw materials these go out to supply employment and wealth to others the farmer may get a trifle more at times, but the packing interest suffers, export business becomes impossible, the western market goes to Chicago and the profits of the transportation companies disappear. Canada is poorer if we allow our raw products to go out. I might apply it to hay and we would have the interesting spectacle of seeing our hay going away, and the cattle and farmers going out on the same train to the United States. The same is true of lumber, pulpwood, iron ore and many other things. The farmer will not be unwilling to live and let live. Will he cripple Canadian enterprise to make Americans rich? There is just one suggestion—I make it quite unauthorized—and it is a suggestion that occurs to me because after all we all realize that from the western point of view the opportunity of exporting Canadian grain to the United States is a very great thing, and we must consider that our western friends will not lightly turn down a proposition of that kind.

But I think it is for Canada to take into consideration the fact that we have certain geographical and climatic conditions which render it somewhat difficult for our farmers to compete with the farmers of Argentina, Australia and New Zealand, and that it would be quite in line for this government, or for any government that may succeed it, to do something towards removing these disabilities. The price of wheat is, I think it is admitted, fixed by Liverpool, and the grain grower practically throughout the whole world gets the Liverpool price less the cost of transportation from his farm to Liverpool. Figure that back and you will come to the Canadian northwest. Now, if our Canadian western farmer, say at Regina, cannot send his grain as cheaply over Canadian lines to Liverpool as the American farmer at Grand Forks, Dakota, or some place immediately south of Regina, does, then there is something wrong. It may be that the transportation rates are too high; it may be that there are other charges that are more than the traffic can bear. Well, we have a Railway Commission, and if, after thorough investigation, it is found that for similar distances it costs more to send Canadian wheat to the British market than it does American wheat, I, for my part, would rather see a bonus (of 2 or 3 cents a bushel) paid to the Canadian farmers than to see that grain going to the United States. Let us keep our own materials in Canada, and then the Americans will come over to us and they will be welcome, and they will build their factories here, and we will make up the raw materials here, and we will supply our own home markets and compete for the

Mr. AMES.

export trade of the world. Sir, Canada would present a sorry sight if she were reduced to the position of digging out and hauling to the nearest railway station her raw materials to have them made up in the country to the south, with all the wealth that accrues from that process going into the pockets of the stranger. There are some who say that this is bound to come anyway, and I think the Minister of Finance told me not long ago that if the Americans wished to take off their duties they have a perfect right to do so. That I admit. I admit that when the Americans need our raw materials they can bring them into their country free of duty. Well, let them do so when they get ready to do it. We can then determine whether it is in our interest to put an export duty on or not, but it will be time enough to face that when it comes. In the meantime, what is the difference between the proposition of the minister and my proposition—the minister's proposition is suicide, the other alternative is murder, and one can die with honour, but one cannot commit suicide with honour. As it is near six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour briefly to summarize what I have endeavoured to bring to the attention of the House. I consider that at the present time we are doing well and have been doing well along safe and conservative lines, and to take a leap in the dark which may possibly turn out for the better, but which stands a great chance of turning cut for the worse, would be, under the circumstances, highly inadvisable. As far as this particular bargain is concerned, don't let us lose sight of the fact that it means the unsettling of established conditions, that it means the loss of our fiscal independence, that it means the ultimate abandonment of the principle of protection for all classes in Canada, that it means the loss of our export identity, and that it means farewell to any opportunity for a preference in the British market. These are some of the sacrifices which Canada will be called upon to make, and, after all, why should we make any sacrifices, because, probably we can, without sacrifice, get all the benefits which are worth having. And when we come to look on the so-called benefits we find that where there is reciprocity in similar products between two nations, one of whom is great and powerful and the other small and weak in point of wealth and population, that if anything goes wrong it is the smaller one that stands to suffer every time. Let us further remember that in letting in the United States we are admitting all the British possessions—whom I should like to see admitted, but by the front door rather than by the back door—and we are also admitting 12 other countries who are giving us absolutely nothing for the priv-