

the committee I would consider out of order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then this is strictly in order, because it has nothing whatever to do with the resolution before the committee.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Is it your ruling, then, that an amendment dealing with the resolution before the committee would be out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not called upon to rule on that point. If the point is raised, after hearing the old parliamentarians, I will decide it.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. gentleman is out of order, then?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is in order; he is speaking to his motion.

Mr. PATERSON. It is strange that the hon. gentleman could not see that. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been reading to the House extracts from newspapers, and have been asking time and again for any expressions of views that have reached the government with reference to this question. Here is an expression of view with reference to it, and why it should be thought that I am contravening any rule of the House by reading it I cannot understand. The article continues:

Since that time numerous efforts have been made to renew the reciprocity trade relations between the two countries. In 1866 a Canadian delegation went to Washington to negotiate a treaty; in 1869, Sir John Rose made the effort; in 1873 George Brown and Sir Edward Thornton repeated the effort, and in 1890-92 Hon. Robert Bond did likewise, with no result.

While these prominent Canadians were making the effort on the part of Canada, various Bills and resolutions for reciprocity with Canada were tabled or voted down in Congress from time to time. After this came the 'Joint High Commission,' which was to settle all points of difference between the two countries including reciprocity.

From this brief history of reciprocity and reciprocity negotiations covering half a century or more, it will be seen that Canada is now getting something our statesmen, at least, have believed all along the Dominion was in need of, and, whether we can all agree as to what should and should not be placed on the free list, we must recognize this, that reciprocity is something our greatest statesmen have fought hard to bring about.

There is another article in the same paper dealing with the same question, which is as follows:

OUR FRUIT HAS NOTHING TO FEAR.

Without wishing to disparage the argument sincerely made by many against the removal of the duty on fresh fruit and vegetables to and from the United States, as provided in

the proposed reciprocity agreement, we object to the underlying thought which bottoms all such argument, that Canadian fruit growers are not able to compete with the American fruit growers in the matter of picking, packing and selling their fruit.

British Columbia fruit, such as peaches, pears and apples,—particularly apples,—could be sold at the highest price in the best markets in America alongside of the best fruit from California, Colorado Washington and Oregon. We have seen Colorado Jonathans push the California Belleflower off the market at Los Angeles, the greatest fruit centre in the world. And, under reciprocity British Columbia fruit growers could ship apples to such centres as this and find a market already built up. For our fruit growers have nothing to fear in competition with the fruit from any of the American districts.

Speaker Cannon, of the American House, spoke significantly at a banquet of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers a few evenings ago.

We have lately had sent to Congress a commercial agreement in name, but a treaty in reality, but one that goes primarily to the House. In a month's time we shall be called upon to enact it as law. I do not know what we are going to do with it. Ask the fruit growers of California what they are going to do when Canadian fruits are free. What answer are we going to give one-third of the population of the country—the farmers?

And are we to fear the American apple on our markets when our fruit is so much superior? If our fruit growers could produce the quantity, the product from the other side would not stand any chance here, for our fruit would command the market. Until we do produce the quantity the present tariff or any other tariff is but a superficial remedy.

As I said, the other side of the question is set out in the letter published in this same paper and signed by Mr. Burrell.

Mr. LALOR. Is that a resolution or an editorial article?

Mr. PATERSON. They are both editorials.

Mr. BURRELL. As the hon. minister has seen fit to introduce my name in this discussion and has also quoted an editorial from the Summerland 'Review,' British Columbia, it is only fair that I should ask the House to bear with me a minute or two along that same line. I have in the Vernon 'News' of February 9 an article which gives the report of the Associated Boards of Trade of the Okanagan valley, which met at Summerland, and which expressed very clearly and explicitly the overwhelming convictions of the fruit growers in that district. That resolution is as follows:

That the Associated Boards of Trade for the Okanagan Valley at their annual meeting now assembled urged in the strongest manner upon the Dominion government the absolute necessity of maintaining the present import duty on fruit as from the United States.