

hon. gentlemen opposite now know what actually has come out of it. They are wise after the event; therefore, opposition is the proper place for them. But some of their number at that time were not so reticent, as was pointed out by the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) the other evening. 'Industry paralysed!' 'Industry destroyed!' The 'wail of industry.' In 1897, this was what some of these hon. gentlemen talked about. Why, it was necessary to add an adjective to describe it, so it was called the sorrowful wail of industry. Sir Charles Tupper used that language (he might have been anticipating the speech my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) made the other night) the sorrowful wail of the manufacturers of Canada in the Montreal 'Gazette.' The sorrowful wail has been patented now, and is being sold by the yard, accompanied by a life-like photograph of the Prime Minister to give some credit to the thing.

There are some prophecies concerning what is going to come out of this arrangement that will not be fulfilled. I venture upon that prophecy very firmly. I think it is a safe position because the prophets are driven to contradict one another and themselves, and their prophecies cannot all work out. It is clear that this arrangement cannot at the same time ruin the Canadian consumer and the Canadian producer of the products that are being consumed (or not being consumed; I do not know what hon. gentlemen opposite really think is going to happen then)—but that is what we are being told, on one hand there is a reason for the greatest alarm on account of the consumer, and on the other hand that the producers of the goods to be consumed are ruined. I think we may confidently look to the nonfulfilment of one of these prophecies. There is some part of the 'sorrowful wail' that will not work out. Now, my hon. friend from North Toronto gave a very good example of his capabilities in the way of prophecy by being a double prophet in his long speech. One of the difficulties of a speech of four hours' duration is that a man is almost sure to forget at the end what he said at the beginning. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) spent three hours in trying to prove that this arrangement would be the disruption of the empire, the ruin of Canadian nationality, and the end of all things. And then, at the end of his speech he turned round quite coolly and said! This is not a reciprocity arrangement at all, it is simply a matter of exchange of jack-knives. We on this side of the House do not regard the British Empire and Canada as quite such flimsy things that they are going to be destroyed by an exchange of jack-knives.

Now, with regard to the effects of this arrangement upon the people of Canada, I think it is a good, sound position to take that trade makes prosperity, that prosperity makes for increased wealth, that prosperity and increase wealth must mean more employment to labour, and benefit all round. Why, Sir, that is capable of very simple proof. Last year this government—which has never reduced any tariffs, which has continued the National Policy, though, by the way, a year after they came into power they were going to ruin the industries of the nation by departing from the National Policy—but that is a small inconsistency—a year ago this government made an arrangement with regard to the German surtax. I was in Prince Edward county ten days ago, and I met a gentleman there who is engaged largely in the evaporation fruit industry, and he told me that at the time that arrangement with Germany was come to, he had 600 cases of evaporated fruit which he could not place. The moment the arrangement was made he got \$300 more for those 600 cases by selling them to Germany than he could have got before the arrangement was made. I think that is very practical proof that the lowering of tariffs promotes trade, that trade promotes prosperity and wealth, because that \$300, or what it represents, would come into Canada, be circulated in Canada, and to that modest extent would increase the material prosperity of the Canadian people.

Now, I think that Mr. Scallion, who came down with the grain growers, put the case for reciprocity in a brief and convincing shape. I was surprised to see that so prominent a man as Premier Roblin, of Manitoba, yesterday said that no one had asked for reciprocity. Well, that is an extraordinary statement for the premier of the province to make, where the grain growers have their headquarters, and it is very scant courtesy to Mr. Scallion to say that no one asked for reciprocity. Mr. Scallion pointed out in so many words what he thought would be the benefit to the farmers of extending their markets; he pointed out that there would be opposition along certain lines, and I must say that he portrayed very accurately the lines of opposition which we have had elaborated in this House. Then he asked the very practical question with regard to this breaking up of the empire. He said: We do \$350,000,000 of trade with the United States now, and I would like to know the exact amount of trade which would be dangerous, because there is no question that, while we have been doing that trade, it has not been leading to the destruction of the empire.

Now, Sir, I do not know that I would dare to make some of the prophecies that are