

in and how long they would keep, but I want to tell him that he did not know what he is talking about, when he made the statement he did. I live in Ontario where we produce as good, if not better, potatoes than are produced on the American continent. We have new potatoes on the 1st of July, pretty well north in the province of Ontario, and we have the potatoes of the previous year up to the 1st of August. These are facts that every farmer knows. There are many farmers in that province who plant from half an acre to two acres with early potatoes, which they are able to send to the market when potatoes are a little scarce, and there are people in the towns and cities who are willing to give a good price for a fancy article, which they like, when it first comes in season. If the duty were taken off at the very time hon. gentlemen opposite speak about, it would reduce the price, and then these farmers would not get for their potatoes anything like the price they do at the present time. There is no use in hon. gentlemen opposite trying to make the farmers of this Dominion believe that they are sincere, when they advocate taking the duty off farm products. I frankly admit that there are times in the year when the consumer would benefit by it, and every man who understands farming will be willing to admit that, but I do not believe that the workmen and the mechanics in the towns and cities will take a chance of getting their potatoes a little cheaper, if they have in prospect the probability of losing their jobs, because if the duties were taken off all around they certainly would not get work as easily as they do at the present time. These gentlemen opposite might as well face the situation once for all, that they cannot talk about benefiting the producer and the consumer at the same time. There are times when probably both are benefited by protection, but not all the time. There is no county in Ontario more rural than the county of Dufferin, which I have the honour to represent, and I firmly believe that 98 per cent of the farmers of that county would advocate that the duty should be increased on farm produce coming from the United States into Canada. If the manufacturers of this Dominion want a duty on what they produce, why should not the farmers of Canada have protection on their products?

The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) told us that the people of Canada made a mistake when they did not accept recipro-

city, but my reply to him is, that there never was a greater insult thrown in the face of any people than was thrown into the face of the farmers of Ontario in respect to that reciprocity treaty. The truth is, that that treaty would have taken everything away from the farmer. If the farmer sent a load of wheat to the market he would have no protection, and he would have to sell it in competition with the wheat of the world. but if he took that load of wheat down to the mill, one mile out of the town, and had it turned into flour, and took that flour back home with him, made as it was from his own wheat, he would find there was a duty on flour and he would have to pay it. If he took a load of hogs, or of sheep, or of cattle, to the market, he had to sell them in competition with all the world, there being no duty on them while the farmer held them, but as soon as he went to the butcher shop to get meat, he had to pay a duty on it. Again, the vegetable grower would have no protection while he held the farm produce, but as soon as the canner got hold of it there was a duty on canned fruits and vegetables, and the consumer had to pay it. The facts are that the farmers stood to lose by it and the consumer gained nothing. The consumer does not want raw wheat, or live stock on the hoof, and there are more vegetables used canned than fresh, and while the farmer had to contend with a free market and sell his products in competition with all the world, the consumer did not get the benefit of what the farmer lost in the transaction. I am glad that the hon. gentleman who now presides over the financial affairs of this country has seen fit to protect the farmer, and I say that there never was a Budget brought down in Canada under which the farmers got a squarer deal than in the Budget submitted to this House this year by the Hon. Mr. White.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka): It is not my intention to deal with this matter at any great length, but I want to give a few figures. It would appear as if we were to have a re-hash of the old argument in favour of reciprocity from hon. gentlemen opposite. I, for one, would naturally have thought that it was so thoroughly discussed in this House and in the country in 1911 that we had heard the last of reciprocity for a long time to come. It appears, however, that we are to be afflicted with the same old arguments, which in my opinion