

Canada and the United States. Further on, with respect to the price paid to the farmers, these gentlemen say:

During the last 20 years the average price of hogs in Ontario and Quebec each year has exceeded the average price of hogs in the United States. We have not had the extreme range in values incident to United States' markets, hence we have not been as high in price during a period of extraordinary high levels, nor have we been as low in price during a period of extraordinary low levels, but the average price throughout any years with the exception of two years when the price was in favour of Buffalo has been higher to the farmers in Canada for their pork products.

I submit that statement for the mature consideration of Canadian farmers who are engaged in hog raising. I think I should put on 'Hansard' a statement made within the last few hours by Sir William Van Horne. This is it:

SICK AND ASHAMED.  
SIR WILLIAM VAN HORNE ON THE  
RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT.  
(Canadian Press Despatch).

Montreal, Feb. 22, 1910.—Sir William Van Horne has just returned from Cuba, highly disgusted at the proposal just put forward to carry through the Fielding-Paterson reciprocity measure. I am too much disgusted to talk about it, he said to-day. Just think of it. Our government returns show that the commerce per capita of the people of Canada is \$97 per head, while the commerce per capita of the people of the United States is \$33, and some odd cents per head. Naturally they look upon us with a covetous eye, and this proposal for reciprocity is the result. Now we are actually proposing to remove the mill dam, and you know what happens when the mill dam is removed the waters find a common level. It is humiliating and disgusting to find such a deal as this one proposed by Messrs. Fielding and Paterson being seriously entertained. I won't trust myself to say another word about it.

'Here just say that my opinions on the subject are summed up in the following,' and Sir William sat down at his desk and wrote:

'Re reciprocity agreement—

'I am sick and ashamed—too sick and too much ashamed to say anything about the subject.'

I quote that opinion from a business man of the standing of Sir William Van Horne against the opinion of my hon. friend from Red Deer as to what is the best for Canada, and I leave the people to draw their own conclusions. As to the linseed oil industry, a gentleman who had a seat in this House a few years ago, and who is engaged in the business writes me:

As soon as the new scheme becomes effective it will kill the linseed oil industry as dead as a mackerel.

That statement from a gentleman who has a good deal of money invested in the industry I commend to the government, and to the people of Canada. Now, the Finance Minister told us the other day that there has been no annexation feeling in Canada for the last 45 years, but the Toronto 'Globe' holds a different opinion, and I quote from its issue of February 9, last:

Twenty years ago there was quite a strong undercurrent of annexation sentiment in the country.

That was in 1891 when the Liberal party were advocating unrestricted reciprocity in Canada. Was that annexation feeling to be found in the ranks of the Conservative party? If so how does it come that in that year the Hon. Edward Blake stated over his own signature in a published letter, that the policy advocated by the Liberal party in 1891, of unrestricted reciprocity, would lead to annexation if it were carried into law. If there is any annexation talk in Canada it certainly is not traceable to the Conservative party. True, it is said, that many years ago certain Conservatives signed an annexation manifesto, but that document also bore the signatures of prominent Liberals of that day, and be that as it may, in after years when these men had a better understanding of our position and more faith in their country they repudiated the sentiments they earlier expressed. Whatever annexation talk there is in Canada is traceable to the policy advocated by the Liberals before they came into office and which at the time was repudiated by some of their best friends. And, Sir, to-day, there are prominent Liberals throughout Canada who declare that if this trade arrangement becomes law there are dangers surrounding it in respect to our nationhood. These gentlemen believe that possibly there may be some talk and some action in this House and in the United States with regard to annexation. I have in my hand a letter dated a few days ago from Aurora, Illinois, from a Canadian who lives in the United States, written to myself, and I will read one paragraph from it:

The view point over here can be summed up briefly. These Americans think they have slipped one over the Canadians. They openly admit and brag over the fact that they have secured a great deal for very little given in return. The Americans think that Canada is beginning to break away from England, and they think that this is the first step on the road to annexation later.

Evidently there is some talk on the other side of the line with respect to annexation. For my part I believe that the best policy for this country is the policy laid down many years ago by the Liberal-Conservative party, of protection for every interest in