

both lines of domestic fruit and vegetables both in season and out of season.

It is a well known fact, that, very often in business, a particular part is the most remunerative, and consequently the backbone of that particular business, the loss of which would be serious. It is this particular part, that reciprocity with the United States would take from us, simply because we are geographically handicapped.

The Fruit and Vegetable Growers,
Clarkson, Peel Co., Ontario.

Going back a little in the history of this parliament, I notice that in 1902, Mr. Leonard, who then represented Laval in this House, and who sat on this side, moved the following resolution :

That it is greatly in the interests of the market gardeners and the farmers that the duties on our Canadian garden products be so adjusted as to guarantee the Canadian farmer an effective protection against foreign competition.

And in the following year, the same gentleman moved exactly the same resolution. These two resolutions were voted down by the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his supporters. But the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and every member on this side recorded their votes for better protection for the farming interests of Canada. I follow that a little further : in 1904 I had the honour of moving this resolution :

That a large and increasing quantity of farm and market garden products is being imported into Canada.

That our own country is fully capable of furnishing an ample supply of such products for our own market.

That under an adequately protective tariff such sufficient supply would always be produced and marketed in Canada.

And that such readjustment should include as far as practicable the imposition of specific instead of ad valorem duties.

That in the opinion of this House the duties upon the said products should be so readjusted during the present session as to secure the Canadian market to the Canadian producer.

Among the requests that the farmers and gardeners make to the government are the following: That duties be imposed as follows:

Asparagus.. . . .	per pound	3 cents.
Cabbages.. . . .	each	3 "
Cauliflowers.. . . .	"	3 "
Celery.. . . .	per doz.	25 "
Beans.. . . .	bush.	45 "
Green cucumbers.. . . .	per doz.	20 "
Onions	bush. of 56 lbs.	40 "
Tomatoes.. . . .	per lb.	5 "
Watermelons.. . . .	each	5 "
Musk melons, cantaloup	"	3 "
Spinach.. . . .	per bush.	25 "

These were some of the requests that the market gardeners of the province of Ontario had made to the government for increase of duty. That resolution was voted down by the right hon. the Prime Min-

Mr. BLAIN.

ister and his supporters, but the leader of the opposition and hon. members on this side recorded their votes in favour of it. A little later, I find somebody on the other side of the House moving a similar resolution. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) moved :

That in the opinion of this House, so long as the Canadian tariff affords, incidentally or otherwise, a considerable degree of protection to manufacturers, some protection may fairly and properly be afforded by our tariff to Canadian agriculturists and stock raisers upon hogs, hog products, garden vegetables and such other items as it may appear possible to so protect with advantage to the agriculturist, and without undue injury to the Canadian consumer.

That resolution was supported by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Schell), whom I see in his place. In a speech of some length made in the interests of the farmer, he stated his opinion that the government should increase the duty on pork. I do not suppose my hon. friend has changed his mind now, but perhaps he has. I must not press that question too closely. The hon. gentleman gave us a very interesting speech in favour of that resolution. The resolution was not voted upon, because the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) requested that it should not be pressed to a vote, explaining that he was going to revise the tariff that year, suggesting to the people of Canada that the farmers' interest would be taken care of in the new revision of the tariff. We have that new revision now, and not only has the request been refused of an increased protection to the farmer, but almost every vestige of protection on articles except pork, on which there is a reduction of duty, has been swept away altogether by the Minister of Finance in the pact he has made with Mr. Taft. I would like to know what the hon. member for South Oxford thinks of that policy—whether he proposes to support it or not. I am saying this to show that after all there has always been in this House a special distinction between the two parties in respect to protection for the agriculturist. That fact was never so manifest as it is in this proposed arrangement. The government are now proposing to take away protection the farmers have had, and the opposition in this House say, no, that as long as there is protection in our tariff, the agriculturist should get a fair share of it. I will follow that up a little further by a quotation from a speech of the leader of the opposition. In the session of 1902-3 the leader of the opposition moved a resolution in the interest of more adequate protection to the farmers, and supported it by a very strong speech. Speaking on April 17 to the resolution for better protection to the farming interests and all other classes, he said :