

dulging in the fiercest criticism of the tendency of this policy from the national point of view. The gentleman whom I am going to quote, is one who had the honour and pleasure of entertaining my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in the city of Vernon. I refer to Mr. Husband, mayor of Vernon, a lifelong Liberal, and highly respected in the district, and who, so far as I know, has always been a consistent Liberal. At the board of trade meeting, at which they protested strongly against the proposals, Mayor Husband spoke strongly on the point to which I have referred. I quote from the Vernon 'News' report of the meeting:

Mayor Husband then said that he would like to offer a few remarks regarding the reciprocity agreement, and proceeded to set forth in very lucid and convincing terms his reasons for opposing it. He thought that every one in the district, who had any knowledge of the circumstances, would agree with the resolution passed by this board—

That is the resolution protesting against the removal of the duty.

—and the associated boards, protesting against the removal of the duty, and he went on to review very thoroughly the various conditions which gave the old established fruit growers of the states to the south a great advantage over us on the prairie markets. . .

Still more important, however, was the effect that such an arrangement would have on our national and political life. The great and patriotic statesmen who had made it their object to build up a strong nation in Canada under British institutions had commenced by uniting the east and west by a line of railway. We have pledged our national credit for many millions to build other roads, with the view of uniting our provinces and maintaining our trade in our own channels. He believed that the trade policy inaugurated by Sir John A. Macdonald was the best possible for Canada at the time, and it was fortunate that another such great statesman as Sir Wilfrid Laurier had continued the development of this policy. Have we reached a stage, he asked, when we can afford to let down our tariff walls? . . .

He felt that any step towards reciprocity was premature and dangerous. It was the beginning of the parting of the ways which might eventually lead to Americanizing the country. While he had every confidence in Mr. Fielding, who he regarded as one of the best finance ministers Canada ever had—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BURRELL. The hon. gentlemen who cheer that sentiment, should let me finish the sentence.

—he feared that in his anxiety to increase trade he had overlooked the grave political danger of such an agreement.

He disliked and mistrusted the attitude of the United States in this agreement. He felt that there was an ulterior motive behind their actions, and concluded by comparing them to the Greeks at Troy, reiterating the

classic warning to beware of the Greeks especially when they bear gifts.

That is all I have to say. I want to make it absolutely clear that the little matter of editorial opinion quoted by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), is abundantly repudiated, and he has his answer at the hands of the Liberal gentlemen whom I have quoted.

Mr. BRADBURY. I hold in my hand a letter from the market gardeners of Manitoba. Last year, I presented to this House a petition in the interests of the market gardeners, and I received a promise from the Finance Minister that nothing would be done in the way of changing the tariff until an investigation had been made. This letter goes on to say:

As secretary of our society, I make a strong protest on behalf of our gardeners, because the government have taken this step without consulting our producers and without any consideration for the petitions already sent to them, and further without any regard for the capital invested in this industry in our country by those now in the business and many others coming in renting land at a big figure and putting their last dollar into their outfits. Free vegetables will simply put these men out of business. The government should consider our local conditions—expensive labour and working and keeping clean these gardens which is a very costly item compared with cheap southern labour, and also our climatic conditions, our severe winter necessarily entailing an enormous expense in heating greenhouses which must be used in order to compete. Our market now is not as it should be, being controlled by a few middlemen. We are just now taking steps to have the city of Winnipeg establish a central market place. The number of gardeners around Winnipeg for five or six miles would be fully 100, with others growing potatoes and other vegetables who do not make a regular business of it. The amount of capital invested would average from \$1,000 to \$3,000. I estimate roughly the amount tied up in these outfits, including horses, machinery, wagons, greenhouses, &c., and not considering the land value, about \$400,000, or perhaps \$500,000. If you included the land value, of course it would be very much more. On learning from the newspapers that this arrangement had been made, I communicated with the President of the Market Gardeners' Association and asked him for a special meeting on Monday next to protest against the action of the government. I see by the papers that it will be up in the House on Tuesday next.

A copy of the resolution sent forward to the government has been sent to me, and I beg to put it on record. It is in the form of a memorial:

To the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Premier of Canada, and to the members of the House of Commons.

Gentlemen,—We, the undersigned market gardeners in the vicinity of Winnipeg now assembled humbly desire to impress upon