

farming community of the Dominion! It may not appear so to others, who do not live in the country as I do, and who have not seen family after family leaving the country and parish after parish deserted by the farmers, but it is astounding to me. There is no use saying that the people are not leaving the land. Any man who lives in any parish in the Province of Quebec, or in any constituency in Ontario or the West, knows that people are compelled to leave this country of ours; and, in the face of that, without a word of warning, the Government comes down with this new proposition for trade with Australia. Australia, did I say? No, not Australia alone, because clause 5 says:

Subject to the provisions of the customs tariff, 1907, the Governor in Council may, by Order in Council, extend the said advantages to goods the produce or manufacture of any British country.

We are not opening the door to Australia alone; we are opening the door to all British countries. Let me read a list of them:

United Kingdom, Aden, Australia, Barbados, Bermuda, British East Africa, British South Africa, British West Africa, British Guiana, British Honduras, British India, British East Indies, British West Indies, British Oceania, British Strait Settlements, Ceylon, Fiji Islands, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Malta, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Nigeria, Palestine, Sierra Leone, Trinidad, and Tobago.

There are 29 in all. If you pass this Bill you are giving the Government power to do that, and if they are so indifferent to the interests of the people of Canada as to bring down this measure without giving us an opportunity of studying it and knowing something about it, they are quite capable of opening the door to any of those people. you will find dutiable goods amounting to \$157,000,000 and free goods amounting to \$37,000,000 coming into Canada from those countries. Therefore we are opening the door to all British possessions.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: That is a good word.

Hon. Mr. POPE: British possessions is a good word, and there are certain people who stand for the permanency of the British Empire, and there are others who do not. We need not argue about that. We all know the story, and it need not be told over again.

Now, so far as this country is concerned, we are told that we cannot export certain products—butter, cheese and cattle. Why do we export them? It is because we produce more than we can consume. We do not export them for the fun or the pleasure there is in it; we export them because we are compelled to export.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: For profit.

Hon. Mr. POPE.

Hon. Mr. POPE: Not always for profit. If we have not a home market for the goods here, we are bound to grow indifferent. We are bound to have indifferent farms, and they are not exported for profit. What do you do? You make a Treaty with a country called Australia, where you can buy beef for \$1.75, or an animal from \$15 to \$17, and a first-class steer for \$22 or \$25. I know what I am talking about. And you are going to ask us to compete simply because we have a surplus of certain things to export. I am surprised at the Finance Minister saying that if he thought this Treaty would interfere with the people producing butter and cows in his County of Chateauguay-Huntingdon, which he said was the second largest county in that regard in Canada, he would not present the measure. Well, if that is the basis upon which national affairs are to be conducted, then I say every honourable gentleman in whose community there are farms is bound to take into consideration local prosperity and to keep in mind every individual in his community who cultivates the soil. But we know that if it were not for the fact that the milk taken from the county of Chateauguay-Huntingdon was consumed in Montreal, a half or a quarter of the cows would not be there. The local market of Montreal takes care of that industry for more than 100 miles around. It is the local market in which we dispose of 90 per cent of the agricultural products of this country, and if it were not for the wheat which we export, the figure would be nearer 100 per cent, and there would be very little in proportion to the total production that we would not consume ourselves. It is quite true that we ship a certain amount of butter when we are obliged to. We do not ship it because we want to or because we get more for it, but because, during a couple of months of the year, we have not a market for it in Canada. The same is true with regard to cheese. But is that any reason why we should open our doors for twelve months in the year and submit to the competition of a country which can produce cheaper than we can?

There is no use saying that we can produce agricultural products as cheaply as they can be produced in Australia and New Zealand with their milder climate. Look at the arrangement and see what it is. Take fresh meat, for instance. If you want to send it to Australia you have to pay 5 cents a pound on it, but when the Australian shippers send it here they pay only $\frac{1}{2}$ cent a pound. On canned meat we pay 5 cents a pound, they pay 15 per cent on onions we pay \$1.50 per hun-