

protective measure. It is designed especially to protect the farmers of the United States from the inroads of Canadian products and products from other countries. It is not levelled at Canada alone, but will operate against all nations of the world, as I understand it; we are only one of the group.

This reciprocity proposition of my hon. friend has been debated on every hustings in Ontario, and it was beaten out of its boots wherever the question was properly fought out in the year 1911. It hadn't a peg to stand on before the argument was over. It was shown that the Canadian market was in every respect a better market for the Canadian farmer than the United States market, and the same can be shown to-day. Let my hon. friends on the other side who are interested in farm products, if there are such, compare the Chicago prices to-day with the prices in Winnipeg, Toronto or Montreal, and they will find that in almost every instance the prices in this country for our farm products are very much higher than the prices in the United States. I have just had called to my attention that the price of hogs is quoted in Chicago to-day at \$10, whereas in Toronto it is close upon \$15 and that is only one example of scores that might be mentioned. There is no one who would lose more by the operation of such a proposition as is embodied in this resolution than the Canadian farmer. That is well known. The western farmer has tried to stampede the farmers of Ontario, but he cannot do it. Wherever this matter is threshed out, the farmer of Ontario will tell the farmer of the West that he does not represent him. Look at the duty on eggs—4 cents a dozen. In spite of that 4 cents a dozen, we have seen eggs landed in Vancouver recently by the hundreds of tons from China. They have also come in from the United States in great numbers, in spite of this 4 cents a dozen duty. Take the case of butter, with a duty of 4 cents a pound. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has just shown that we imported 2,000,000 of butter last year. I am quoting these figures merely to show that if we had not a tariff on farm products, they would be coming into this country in much greater quantities than at present. Our farmers in Ontario at least are protected by the tariff, in spite of anything my hon. friends from the West may say. The farmers of Ontario, our fruit growers, and I think our tobacco growers and several others all will tell my hon. friend

from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and my hon. friend from Red Deer that their panacea is absolutely no good so far as Ontario is concerned, and that is the absolute truth. Reciprocity as proposed by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's and as contained in the four corners of this resolution has nothing in it for Canada; there is no good to be obtained from it. The reciprocity agreement that my hon. friend now proposes to put into force was voted down in the year 1911 by one of the largest majorities Canada has ever seen. Only in 1917, I think was that majority exceeded. The question was debated upon every possible ground, and on every possible ground it was found wanting. I am one of those who want to remain friendly with the United States; I have travelled a good deal over there, and have many friends over there, but I want to say to this country; if you want to preserve your dignity and self respect in the United States you must show yourselves as men who can take care of themselves, and not men, like my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster), who are prepared on the least pretext to surrender. His policy is this: "Don't shoot, I will come down." My policy is to stand up and fight them, if necessary, on the tariff or any other question.

The only way that we can meet the Fordney Bill, if such a preposterous measure becomes law in the United States, is to have up our sleeves a corresponding style of argument. That policy may be old-fashioned, but I apprehend that it is somewhat British, and I am surprised to find that my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), who in war time is considerably bellicose, is prepared to surrender root and branch and give up the whole field to the United States. That hon. gentleman says that we cannot sell unless we buy. I think that is his doctrine. Well, it is a fallacious one, as anyone can see on the face of it. If the doctrine is true, that we cannot sell unless we buy, why, may I ask the hon. member, is the United States selling to us nearly twice as much as we are selling them? Why do they not have to buy in order to sell? Can my hon. friend tell me that? I think not. It is not necessary to buy in order to sell, Mr. Speaker. What you want is the goods that the world wants at the prices the world is prepared to pay. If you can meet this condition, you will do business every time. I repeat, Sir, that the only way you can meet the Fordney Bill is to stand up like men; and we in Canada have nothing to