

to show by quoting a few figures that the surplus farm production in the United States was greater than the surplus farm production in this country. I did so because under the reciprocity agreement natural products are vitally affected. May I be permitted to summarize in regard to a few articles which are of vital importance to the farmers of the eastern provinces of Canada, at least, namely, butter, cheese, eggs, lard, and meats. The exportable surplus of these articles I have named in the year 1916 was some \$57,000,000 for Canada, and \$271,000,000 for the United States; 1917, Canada \$68,000,000, and the United States \$390,000,000; 1918 Canada \$99,000,000, and the United States \$644,000,000, or for the three years, \$225,741,000 for Canada, and \$1,305,000,000 for the United States. Comparing 1918 with 1916, Canada's exportable surplus of these articles increased by 72 per cent, as compared with an increase in the United States for the same years of 138 per cent. That does not indicate, to me at all events, that the United States presents the market for our products that the hon. member for Red Deer would have us believe.

May I refer for a moment to the question of the adverse trade balance, and in this connection I wish to quote a few words uttered by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) in the session of 1920. The hon. member permitted me to put a question to him in the course of his speech, and here are his words—Hansard, 1920, p. 147:

MR. EDWARDS: The minister also said we should import less.

MR. CRERAR: I grant that is one way to help the situation out.

Then he went on to state:

Where does the remedy lie for this condition of our exchange? It lies in greater production in this country and in selling more goods. It lies also in curtailing imports from the United States.

I venture to assert that the removal of every possible restriction so far as natural products are concerned is not a way to curtail the import of these products into Canada. But that was the position taken by the hon. member for Marquette, and I submit that it is not in accord with the position taken by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) in the House this afternoon. Speaking in Timiskaming a short time ago the hon. member for Red Deer said that while there was no doubt in the public mind as to his being an out-and-out free trader, there might be some difference

[Mr. Edwards.]

of opinion in regard to some of his followers, but for all practical political purposes there was not one whit of difference between them. Now I find considerable difference in their expressions of opinion at least.

May I be permitted to refer to another remark made by the hon. member for Red Deer. He thinks he sees on this side of the House certain hon. gentlemen who will be glad to support this resolution. Now I am going to give a few reasons, some nine or ten, Mr. Speaker—that is all I shall take time to give—why I think the political vision of the hon. gentleman is very defective and sadly in need of special treatment. Most hon. members of this House will recall that the hon. member on a former occasion told us, in a burst of candour, that he had salved his conscience for giving support to the Liberal party for a number of years by turning the handle of a cream separator and by fraying a piece of binder twine until his fingers were fairly sore. Well, if the hon. member for Red Deer could excuse, shall I say his docile or complacent support of a policy under which the tariff was much higher than our tariff is to-day, by turning the handle of the free cream separator and by fraying a piece of free binder twine, I think I can give him some reasons why hon. members on this side can find ample justification for refusing to support the amendment now proposed. On the following list of agricultural implements, ploughs, binders, mowers, reapers, seed drills, weeders, manure spreaders, harrows, traction engines, separators, farm wagons, windmills, fanning mills, and cultivators, 14 in all, if reciprocity had carried the average duty on these articles would have been 17.33 per cent. The average duty on these articles to-day under our present tariff is 14.64 per cent. There are four articles on that list, cultivators, fanning mills, harrows, and seed drills, on which if reciprocity had carried the duty would be exactly the same as it is to-day. There are nine articles on that list on which if reciprocity had carried the duty would be higher than it is to-day. There is one article on that list on which the duty is higher to-day than it would be if this amendment carried. These are my nine reasons, Mr. Speaker. Some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House may say: I will not support this amendment because I believe the duties on farm implements should be reduced. I will not support an amendment which, if