

every product of Canada as to those of any other country. It will receive every pound of Canadian produce which we choose to send free, and it is open to every other nation under Heaven just as freely as it is to us. The English market gives us no advantages, but places us in precisely the same position as it does all the other nations in the world. And while I rejoice in the fact that a large trade in many articles is springing up in the mother land, that trade is springing up there simply because it is the best market we could find under existing circumstances for those articles. If under this Government's policy we close forever the American market against our products, we can send them to Great Britain, but we shall not be able to sell them there at as good advantage as we could in the United States if we had free trade with that country. What we want for our agriculturists is to obtain for them access both to the United States and English markets. These markets will not be closed against us until they are closed against other nations. But let us deal a little with this question of unrestricted reciprocity, to which the hon. gentleman alluded in the closing part of his speech. He asked the hon. member for South Oxford to say whether he favoured unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. At last the hon. gentleman has found that there is a distinction apparently between the two. Hon. gentlemen opposite have hitherto always contended that these phrases mean the one and the same thing. Now, my hon. friend admits that there is a difference; but on rising to speak on the amendment introduced by my hon. friend from South Oxford it was not necessary for the hon. gentleman to ask what his policy is, because the very proposition he rose to criticize enunciates that policy. What is that policy? Why, it is that in the negotiations which this Government have declared they are about to enter upon with the Washington authorities in October next they should be prepared to conduct them in the spirit and on the terms of the most extended reciprocal relations that can be had. That is the proposition which my hon. friend from South Oxford has fairly laid down. There was no necessity for the hon. gentleman asking for an explanation of it, as the amendment fully explains itself. Hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed themselves in favour of reciprocity with the United States in natural products, and they are going to Washington presumably to attain that object. But is there any possibility of their being able to secure from the Washington authorities reciprocity in natural products on the basis of the treaty of 1854? Well, they have been told by Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of State, or they might have learned it from the letter he has written, that he will never be prepared to grant reciprocity on these terms, and that being the case, the House cannot give the Government credit for being sincere in their desire for any measure of reciprocity at all. Why, Sir, what is the position taken by the Finance Minister, who was one of the delegates to Washington, and proposes to go there again. He is going there, he says, to obtain reciprocity in natural products. We know what he thinks with regard to the value of the American market for the products of our farms. As the mouthpiece of the Government he spoke in Toronto, when the House was dissolved, and laid down the policy of the Government on that occasion. What

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

did he then say with reference to the United States market as a desirable outlet for our farm products. He said:

"They talk, Sir, about the natural market. They say the United States is our market. I say that in my opinion the only thing that constitutes a market is demand and supply, and the proper market for a country, the best market, is where there is the greatest demand alongside of the lowest home production to satisfy that demand. Senator Carlisle, who is often quoted by the Opposition, never said a truer thing than in his speech on the McKinley Bill, when, ridiculing the idea of natural markets being necessary, he stated that the best natural market was where the goods that a country produces are required at the maximum. Take that rule and apply it to Great Britain. We have a surplus in agricultural products. Why should we go to a market in the United States where they have a surplus of the same class of products that we have to sell? Should we go to Great Britain, where millions of mouths are crying for food and only a small percentage of the necessary supply is produced at home, where we are not met by hostile tariffs or by vacillating tariff legislation, as we have had in the United States, when once we have set the current of trade in a certain direction to run up against it and throw all things away, a country that is willing to pay and is able to pay, a country that must continue to import for all time? The natural market is not a country that produces a surplus, as does the United States, but Great Britain, which does not produce a surplus, and in which there is a sustained demand."

Now, that is the view the Minister of Finance entertains with reference to the value of the United States market to the farmers of this country. He asks the question: Why should they go to a market in the United States where they have a surplus of the same class of products that we have to sell? Let me ask now: Why did he go to Washington and beg and beseech for an interview if, peradventure, they might in any way get this market of the United States that is of no use to us? The hon. gentleman was not the only one that spoke, for we find that the Minister of Agriculture was at that same meeting announcing the Government policy, and what did he say with reference to the American market? The Minister of Agriculture said:

"It has been stated that the United States is our natural market. I contend that it is not our natural market. I contend that they are our competitors in everything we produce. Everything they produce we produce, and they are our natural opponents with the exception of, perhaps, bananas, oranges and peanuts."

Here the Minister of Agriculture, a member of the Government, declares that the United States market, instead of being a benefit to the people of this country and to be desired by them, is rather the reverse, except, perhaps, in respect to bananas, oranges and peanuts, in which articles, he admits, they would not be competitors. There you have the Finance Minister and the Minister of Agriculture stating that the markets of the United States, even for our natural products, are valueless to us; you have them going to Washington and begging for an interview, after all they said against the Washington Government, going there after all the insulting things they said with reference to the American people, and begging and seeking an interview, and coming home rejoicing in announcing to this House that they had succeeded in so far that Mr. Blaine had fixed a day when they might go back and renew negotiations for a treaty in order to secure the inestimable boom for our farmers of a market for their natural products, a market proclaimed by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture to be valueless. Why should they go to the United States for a market? That is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite, of these gentlemen who, three or four days after dis-