

given, is always good, and he goes on to laud the treaty—with faint praise, it is true, relative to that expressed for others which have gone before—simply because this, like its predecessors, is denominated "reciprocity." Well, if one is in favour of vivisection it does not follow that one wants the whole human race vivisected. If one is not opposed to the use of anaesthetics, it does not mean that one feels we all ought to be anaesthetized all the time. Reciprocity may be good, well designed and well executed, or it may be bad, ill designed and ill executed.

The honourable gentleman refers to the treaty of 1854-66, which was suddenly terminated by our great neighbour, undoubtedly to our dismay at the time; and he thinks because that termination made us sorry we must always be eager for any kind of reciprocity, with any country, for all time to come.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The men of that time were under that impression.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Likely the honourable gentleman would have been in favour of that treaty, and I might have been. But reciprocity suitable to that time may not be wise to-day. Then this country was simply producing natural products. We had hardly any industrial organization at all. In this whole Dominion we had scarcely an area worthy of the name of a fruit area.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Nor were we exporting potash.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: We were producers of simple natural products in huge quantities, and a stoppage of the market which had been established in those products shook this country to its centre and threatened the very future of this Dominion. When that occurred, while we were at all times ready to try to restore the treaty, we set about adjusting ourselves to conditions which were forced upon us, and the result of our efforts over sixty to eighty years is something of which every Canadian is proud. We are no longer simply a country producing natural products; we are no longer mere sellers of wheat and of raw results of human labour. We are producers of almost every manufacture known on the North American continent. Canada is a tremendous industrial country; smaller, it is true, than our great neighbour, yet a big exporter to the markets of the world. Now we have fruit areas and vegetable areas of vital importance to this Dominion.

This was more or less our position in 1911, and it was because of the progress we had made, because of the growth of this country to the stature of nationhood in every sense,

that we examined closely and critically the reciprocity proposal of that time. We found that while there was much we were obtaining under that proposal, we were giving away vastly more. We found that a great section of the southern part of the province of Ontario would have been desolated, as would have been a large section of the province of British Columbia—yea, and of the province of Nova Scotia—by the mere provision that fruit was to be admitted free. Here we were, with our fruits maturing two, three or four weeks later than the fruits of the United States, and we had sent word to that country that we would bind ourselves under the treaty to let our markets be flooded with American fruits during those two, three or four weeks, to the obvious and inevitable destruction of a great industry which was supporting vast numbers of our people. The honourable senator opposite told us not long ago that he would vote for that, if it came before him.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I would vote for the 1911 convention.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: That he would vote for free admission of American fruit. He would not go to British Columbia and say so.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I would vote for the whole convention of 1911.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: He would not go to southern Ontario and say so, nor to the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Hon. Mr. Fielding was in favour of it.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: That treaty was defeated and cancelled, not merely by the Conservative party, but by an enormous majority of the people of Canada. The honourable gentleman likes to revert to that 1911 arrangement and to lament the disaster which he feels Canada suffered by its defeat. He apparently thinks it might have been in full effect to-day. About two years after the treaty was defeated our West, which in the main was in favour of it, was craving for it, at least in part; and the part which the West especially favoured was that providing for free admission of its wheat into the United States. That country placed upon its Statute Book a standing offer to admit our wheat and flour free of duty if we would give the same treatment to such products from the United States. We took up the offer, but the ink was not dry on our statute when the American Government cancelled the whole arrangement. Does the honourable gentleman remember that? We have not heard anything about free wheat for nearly twenty years.