

to ask hon. gentlemen who argue the other way, what is the difference between the farmer and the lumberman, from the point of view of production? The lumberman, after he supplies home demand, has to go into the foreign market with his products, where he must enter into competition with the products of all other countries, and where the law of supply and demand regulates the prices. Why should the farmers not be subject to the same conditions? And any system of legislation that will place them in a different position from other people is not fair to all classes in the community. I was more than pleased the other night when I heard the Minister of Finance declare that his Government was committed to the policy of reciprocity if such a policy could be secured on fair and honourable terms. I have always been in favour of a policy of reciprocity. I believe it would be a great advantage to this country, and the great republic to the south, and if I have been a strong supporter of the National Policy ever since it was inaugurated, I have been so because we could not help ourselves. I never had any hope, so long as the Republican party remained in power, of our being able to negotiate a policy of reciprocity with the United States. These gentlemen, whether they were right or wrong, succeeded in keeping themselves in office for many years on the cry, at any rate, that the protective tariff protected the labouring men of the country; that their system of protection kept these men from being reduced to a condition of pauperism such as existed among the same classes on the other side of the Atlantic. The majority of the people accepted that statement and voted to keep that party in power; and so long as that party could get in power and carry the country on that condition of things, just so long would they stick to it. In addition to that, they saw the country prosperous, its railway system extended from one end to the other, its wealth increasing, and they attributed that to the protective policy, and, whether right or wrong, they were not going to make any change. But there must be an end to everything. At the last general election they went to the country more fairly and squarely on the trade policy in that election than they ever did before, and as a natural result they got badly beaten. I think that the success of the Democrats at that election, if it teaches anything, teaches that the people came to the conclusion, that when they are obliged to go to a foreign market with the products of the soil and the mines and everything they have to sell, and compete against the producers of other countries, they should be allowed to buy what they require for their own necessities under the same conditions. I may be entirely mistaken, but that is the way it strikes my mind, and I do hope that when the new administration in the United States comes into power, there will be a disposition on the part of the

American Government to have a fair treaty of reciprocity with the Dominion. I believe such a treaty will be of immense advantage to both countries. We used in the Maritime provinces to have the markets of the New England States for our lumber, lime, potatoes, agricultural products and coal, and it would be an immense advantage to us and increase the output of these articles very materially, and give an impetus to the coasting trade of these provinces, if we had such a treaty, and I was pleased when the Finance Minister made the statement that the Government stood committed to a policy of that kind, provided that the treaty could be got on fair and honourable terms. If such a treaty can be had I am prepared to support the party in getting in. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House very much longer this evening. It is very late. I do not know what I can say in reference to the National Policy or the trade question that I have not already said that would be new or interesting to the House. The whole thing has been threshed out. On one side figures have been given showing that the National Policy has ruined the country, while on the other side figures have been given showing that it has been a boon. We know the value of the statements made by extremists on either side, and for my part I do not take a great deal of stock in them. It matters little how eloquently they are put. I have my own opinion of these matters. There has been much said on this question; it has been placed before us in every shape, form and fashion. I have wondered at the ingenuity with which the matter has been spoken about for the last two weeks; I have wondered at the ingenuity of men, and the way they have treated the tariff question and the exodus, and the National Policy, and the blue ruin, and the country going to the dogs, and we all getting poor, until I have sometimes wondered if there was anybody left in the country at all. I am sure I listened to the hon. gentleman from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), and I really do not know what he was talking about; I would be much surprised to know that the hon. gentleman himself understood what he was talking about. His figures were mixed up, without head or tail, top or bottom, and, to make the matter worse, they were presented in such a way that I could not make anything of them. Under these circumstances, it is little or no use for any man to stand up here to talk to empty benches, or to people who have no interest in him if he has nothing new to say. The question has been threshed out, and has been presented to the country in every shape. I thank you for the very kind hearing you have given me in this my first attempt at speech-making. Had I spoken at an earlier stage I might have said something of interest, but others have said these things ahead of me, and I feel that I am out of the race at this stage of the debate. On some other occasion I hope I may get into harness