

city treaty, enjoyed such advantages that she has desired to get such a treaty ever since, and that if Canada required a reciprocity treaty then she requires one equally as much in 1911. Does it necessarily follow that that is correct? Is it likely to be correct? Are the conditions of Canada the same to-day as they were twenty years ago, or the same as they were in 1866? Not at all. Most of the hon. gentlemen who spoke on this question have given expression to the same principle, and have employed practically the same argument. The hon. member for South Wellington says that what was suitable for Canada in 1866 is just as suitable to-day. I would like to ask him to apply that to himself.

The 'Parliamentary Companion' tells us that he was then a mere babbling infant, and that about all he needed was a bath tub, a little human milk moderately hot and a good deal of spanking to make a boy of him. But he grew up and he developed, and he came to manhood. Does he require nothing more to-day than he did in his infancy? What has happened in the meantime? He has increased in stature, in vigour, in mentality and to-day he is a full grown man. To ask him to be content now with what suited him in his swaddling days is as absurd as to ask Canada in the year 1911 to be content with what she required in the year 1866. Twenty years have brought great changes to Canada: We have grown to nationhood; we have developed strength; our people require different conditions and pursuits now from what they did then. What was suited to Canadians 20 years ago does not suit them to-day. True, as the hon. gentleman told us, the eastern and western dairymen have passed resolutions in favour of this arrangement and no doubt they spoke honestly and with the best intentions, but after all they may not be the best judges, and we will have to leave it to the future to determine. The hon. gentleman told us that the foreign trade of the port of Montreal was \$15,000,000 and I can tell him that our fear is that if this arrangement goes into effect, that trade instead of developing as it ought to develop in proportion to the increased wealth and population of the country, will be retarded if not destroyed. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) told us what was going to happen to Nova Scotia fish if they did not get reciprocity with the United States. Might I ask him what has happened to the maritime fish trade up to the present hour? He told us that none of their fish was sold in Ontario and the west, but I would refer him to his political friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) to know if it is not true that that gentleman for years has been doing a very large and remunerative trade in fish with Montreal and Toronto and other cities in these provinces. The hon. gen-

tleman (Mr. Kyte) told us that the English market was of little value to the maritime provinces for fish products; he told us that the interprovincial trade in Canada was of no consequence and that if they got a free market in the United States for their fish they would have all they could desire. But, the value of the product of our fisheries last year was \$15,000,000, and I find from the statistics that of that the United States took \$4,627,000 worth while the English market which the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) has such a contempt for took \$5,899,000 worth. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) announced an economic fallacy when he said that the natural resources of our country are for the people of to-day, and not for the people of the future. Is there any wisdom in such a policy. Are we living only for ourselves and for the present; are we to pay no heed to posterity; are we to recklessly waste what nature has given us and leave to future generations a depleted country. Sir, such a policy would be the height of folly. I say that a wise and intelligent people in this or any generation will say: It is ours to use economically the gifts of nature, not to waste or destroy, but to save what we do not really need for those who come after us. That, Sir, is our real duty to ourselves and to our country. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) told us that this reciprocal arrangement would give to the maritime provinces a market for their potatoes. He was asked what quantity of potatoes had been sent from the maritime provinces to the United States last year, and he could not tell, although he ventured the opinion that the interprovincial trade in potatoes was of little or no value. Well, the facts are that large quantities of maritime province potatoes are used in Ontario and Quebec, and three years ago when in Winnipeg I was told that most of the potatoes they were then using were brought from the province of Prince Edward Island. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that last year the United States sent into Canada \$52,597 worth of poultry, while Canada only sent to this great market of 95,000,000 people \$3,576 worth. In view of these figures the poultry raisers in Canada will not have much to hope for from this trade arrangement, and with regard to potatoes, as to which the hon. gentleman thought the American market would be so valuable, this 95,000,000 people took last year from all Canada \$36,710 worth. What a wonderful benefit it will be to the Nova Scotians to get that market for their potatoes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a wonder they took that much, with the duty of 25 cents a bushel.

Mr. SPROULE. I wonder that they took any at all. They never take any more than