

procuity in natural products. I see an hon. gentleman opposite me, the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who, I am sure, would never support a treaty along the lines of 1854. The hon. gentleman made an eloquent speech here last year and the year before, in which he stated that it would destroy the interests of the Canadian farmers if we had a treaty in natural products. And in order to enlighten him, as he has forgotten it, and in order to enlighten his party, and to show the inconsistency that prevails among them, I will read a few extracts which will edify him and instruct my hon. friends on this side, as to the position that the would-be Minister of Agriculture takes upon this question. On page 3045 of the *Hansard* of 1890, he says:

"I would like to ask the farmers of Canada whether they would be willing to allow the bogus cheese and butter that is made by millions of pounds over in that country, to be sent into our own country to the destruction of one of our most important industries."

Well, Sir, reciprocity along the line of 1854 would destroy that industry, according to your doctrine, and, therefore, you are opposed to the proposition of the Government. Then he goes on:

"There is no farmer in Canada to-day that could prosecute that industry profitably as he now does, if we had unrestricted reciprocity."

Now, unrestricted reciprocity would not affect that more than restricted reciprocity, because reciprocity, according to the principle of 1854, would include this very article as well as the other, so that he is opposed to reciprocity in natural products. Then, speaking of pork, the hon. gentleman says further on:

"If the price advances only half a cent a pound, and it will be that at the very lowest computation, it means on 15,000,000 pounds of pork, \$76,030 for the farmers. Taking other lines of products, and beef, on which there would be a duty of three cents a pound, it is easily understood what an important advantage is given to our farmers."

Again he says:

"In my part of the county there is a great deal of attention given to raising plums; we ship about 10,000 bushels a year, and if it was not for this duty of 30 cents a bushel, our orchard owners would be brought in direct competition with the American fruit raisers."

Now, see what he says. He takes up butter and cheese and says it would destroy the interests of the farmer in that trade to have reciprocity. He takes up pork and says it would destroy the pork trade of our farmers if we had reciprocity. He takes up the fruit trade and says that reciprocity would destroy the interests of our farmers in the fruit trade. It shows to my mind that the hon. gentleman is supporting a Government whose policy he does not understand. But let me quote from another authority on the matter. Last year, you will remember, there was an able and popular gentleman belonging to the Government. He represented an eastern constituency, he was a very eloquent man, a man very popular among his colleagues, and he was put up last year to propound the policy of the Government upon the trade question. During that eloquent speech he was asked a question by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and in reply to that question he made use of these words:

"I am sure the farmers of this country will endorse me when I say that free trade between Canada and the United States in all agricultural products, would be the worst possible thing that could happen to the farmers of our country."

That was the policy of the Government last year. They went before the country this year saying that
Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

they wanted that very policy to be established between the two countries that he condemned last year. But I will come still nearer to the Government than that. We were told from platform after platform that unrestricted reciprocity would destroy our cattle trade; we were told it would destroy our flour trade, that it would reduce the price of pease and oats to a corn standard by the introduction of free corn. We were told it would introduce cheap American flour and destroy the Canadian market for flour, and we were told that by supporters of the Government high up in the esteem of the party. But the paper that supports them, the organ of the Conservative party in the city of Toronto, that great organ which is the mouth-piece of Conservative public opinion, the organ that has been supported by the Conservative party, yea, built up from its very foundation by the Conservative party, and every word it says is supposed to be the echo of the leaders of the party—what has it said in regard to reciprocity in cattle? It said that such a policy would destroy the cattle trade, and it published that announcement in its columns with large display letters in order to attract the attention of the farmers to that particular point. We saw an advertisement that was put into that paper and kept there for weeks during the election campaign, headed with large display letters. Here is what the *Empire* says:

"Facts!—Farmers!—It would kill the cattle trade!—This is no exaggeration, but a sober solid fact.—This is exactly what unrestricted reciprocity would do."

"Why? Because Canadian cattle are now allowed the special privilege of entering Great Britain alive and of being taken into the interior of the country for sale."

"The United States cattle are scheduled, that is, must be killed immediately on arrival, because there is cattle disease in that country and none in this."

"This privilege is worth to you, Canadian farmers, at least \$10 per head of cattle!!"

"We could not keep out United States disease from this country under unrestricted reciprocity, because we would be virtually one country."

"Great Britain for protection of her own farmers, and through no ill-will to us, would be forced to schedule your cattle:"

"And you would lose over \$650,000 per year on your cattle alone!"

Sir, now, in face of all these facts, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite how can they be consistent in telling the people of this country that they are going to Washington on the 12th of October, to negotiate a treaty along the lines of a policy which they assert will destroy the interest of the farming community of this country? Sir, we are not of that opinion on this side. We believe that a reciprocity in natural products would be a great advantage to our farmers, that it would give them an open and a freer market, it would give them two strings to their bow, the English market for what it would take, and the American market for what it would take, and in this way it would largely increase the prosperity of the Canadian farmer. That is one advantage coming from reciprocity in natural products only. But we go further, and we say that if the manufactured articles of the United States were permitted to come in free and our own to go in there free, then we would be able both to sell in the dearest market for our products and buy in the cheapest. But, Sir, is it possible that the Government of the present day are seeking to gull the people of this country? Is it possible they are telling the people in one part of the country that the policy is reciprocity, and they are telling the people in another