

way. But let anyone take the list of free articles of farm produce I have submitted to you, and he can readily see how the removal of duty benefits the farmer.

Special Benefits.

But I might, however, specify one or two things where the experience of our farmers has demonstrated the benefits of an unhampered market. Now as to barley. It is well known that when barley, (before the McKinley tariff of 1890 killed the trade) had cheap entry into the United States, farmers had great success in growing and selling barley in that market. Canada, especially Ontario, grows the best barley for malting purposes, on the continent, and it is in great demand by United States' brewers. In 17 years, from 1876 to 1892—seventeen years of low duty—the farmers of Canada sent to the United States 135 million bushels of barley and got in cash for it 90 million dollars. The next seventeen years the high duty on barley prevailed, and the 135 million dwindled to a total of only seven millions of a value of only 3 million dollars. In the first period under a 15 cents a bushel duty, the average price was 67 cents. In the second period, when the duty was 30c. a bushel, the average price was 42c. If a duty of 15 cents a bushel resulted in a profitable trade in barley for the Canadian farmer—giving him a big market and good profits—

If a duty of 30c per bushel practically killed the barley industry—

Will not free barley, as proposed by reciprocity, restore a profitable market to the farmer and be a money-making proposition? There may be some present who remember the conditions about fifty years ago, when the old reciprocity treaty was in force. If they don't remember, their fathers have told them that these were the big days for barley raisers, when farmers got big prices—from 80c. to \$1.00—and even more, a bushel. And they also told them what a blow the abolition of the treaty was to the farmers. They told them how the price of wool dropped from 40c. to 15c. per pound; of lambs, from \$4.50 to \$2.50, how barley, which sold from \$1.00 to \$1.20 and \$1.25 dropped to 40c. or 50c. And the prices of cattle and hogs were cut in half—and so on with all that the farmer sent to the United States' market under the reciprocity treaty of 1854-1866. If getting Ontario barley into

the United States fifty years ago free of duty—was a good thing for the farmers—if a moderate rate of duty made barley growing and shipping profitable from '76 to '92—if 30c. a bushel duty between 1892 and 1911 killed the business—is it not reasonable to say that an entire removal of the duty on barley will be a distinct and big boon to the farmers of Ontario, who under reciprocity will command, the whole of the Eastern United States' market, and the Western States will give a new market to western barley. In the Canadian west barley grows to perfection, and is a sure crop, as it ripens early and escapes frost risk.

The 30 cents a bushel United States' duty that killed the Canadian barley trade, is still in force.

The reciprocity agreement will, if adopted, remove that duty and restore one of the most profitable crops to a large and profitable market.

The Potatoes and Apples.

Then take another crop that can be grown to advantage in Ontario—potatoes. How could reciprocity affect their sale? During twelve years of high duties—the present duty is 25c. per bushel—Canada sent to the United States eleven million dollars' worth more potatoes than the United States sent to us. Crops on this continent are not all uniform. Sometimes when we have a big crop, parts of the United States have short crops—then our neighbours come to us and that is our harvest—prices advance. With the duty removed, is it not reasonable to assert that reciprocity in the case of potatoes, as in the case of barley, would be of immense advantage to the farmers, without injuring the manufacturer, the working man and the financier? In 1910 Canada exported a total of 1,920,000 bushels of potatoes valued at \$1,133,000. Britain, which admits potatoes free, took \$260,000 worth. Cuba \$695,000, and the United States, \$345,000. The potatoes sent to the United States had to overcome a duty of 25c. per bushel. With this duty removed, would not the profit of shipping potatoes, the profit of growing them, and the inducement to grow them be greatly increased, to the benefit of the Canadian farmer? I have referred to the effect of reciprocity upon the fruit industry, especially small fruits. As to how it will affect the apple trade, which is every year growing in importance, let me give the testimony of