

a new policy, a reversal of the policy which had been the constant policy of both the Conservative and the Liberal party—the policy of reciprocity in natural products with the United States. Is it not now amusing to hear Tories and manufacturers denouncing the farmers of Canada as egotistical, as carrying on a class movement, when it is their own selfishness which alone has created the farmers' movement?

Sir Wilfrid Laurier knew under what complex conditions the verdict of the people had been obtained in 1911 and he decided again to appeal to the people of Canada on the Taft-Fielding Reciprocity pact at the following election. I may say that in 1913 I was asked by him, as I was going to Washington, to carry a message to the new President recently installed, Mr. Woodrow Wilson, and to ask him if he was favourably inclined to the policy of reciprocity and good-will between the United States and Canada, to maintain the Act which was then on their statute book. Mr. Woodrow Wilson promised sympathetic consideration—that was all I could expect—and up to this moment that reciprocity arrangement has remained on the statute book of the United States.

In 1921 the Tory policy of estrangement has triumphed, and to-day we see the American Congress endeavouring to raise their own tariff. The Tory party and the present Tory Government should indeed be happy. Their policy of "no truck nor trade" with our neighbours to the south of us is gaining its full fruition. According to their light, the country indeed must be saved.

Their policy in 1911 was of only one kind: towards the United States it was a policy of ill will. I have told you what they did, and of the harvest they are reaping to-day. If they are sincere, if they were sincere, they must be happy indeed. If they are not, it seems to me that it would befit them to be silent in order to save their faces.

I doubt very much their sincerity, for they seem to be wincing under the blow and crying aloud. Just a few days ago Sir George Foster sang quite another tune than the "no truck nor trade" refrain of 1911. In New York, yes, in New York, because the present ministers and their predecessors have travelled very often to New York since 1911—Sir George made a speech which was cited by my honourable friend the leader of the Liberal party in this Chamber, wherein he said: "We are pretty good neighbours to you; we bought \$921,000,000 worth of stuff from you in 1920, and you

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

purchased only \$560,000,000 worth from us; let us be neighbours; try and buy as much from us as we buy from you, and do not offer us 88 cents for our dollar." Sir George then referred to the Fordney Tariff Bill as a measure which would prevent Canada sending its cattle, its sheep and its agricultural products to the United States in order to pay for our purchases. He hinted at reprisals when he said: "We may have to consider reducing our purchases; it may be a good thing to think of these things before we legislate too far." The honourable gentleman did not stop to think of these things in 1911, when he and his friends refused the Reciprocity Treaty which had been signed by the United States. I venture to say that the people of Canada to-day feel that their interests were sacrificed in 1911, and sacrificed for the lust of power. Reprisals will not prevent our buying raw materials to keep our mills going; but lust of power more than loyalty to flag and country animate the Tory party. They sacrificed their principles of reciprocity for power in 1911. In 1910, when the present Postmaster General was occupied in the province of Quebec in shooting holes into the British flag in Drummond-Arthabaska—

Hon. Mr. BLONDIN: That is an absolute lie. I have denied it in the House of Commons and I deny it here, and I want the honourable gentleman to take that back right away.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I understand that the honourable gentleman cited a speech—

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: Take it back.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I understand that the honourable gentleman in that campaign repeated a speech which had been delivered in Lévis, in which that phrase was used.

Hon. Mr. BLONDIN: The honourable gentleman is not sure of his ground. He says he understands. First he said that I was shooting holes in the British flag; now he says he understands that I was reported as having quoted a speech that had been made at Lévis. What does the honourable gentleman mean by that?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Yes or no, did the honourable gentleman repeat a speech in which such a phrase was used?

Hon. Mr. BLONDIN: Does my honourable friend know what he is talking about? Will he tell us exactly what his information is?