

Macdonald to secure reciprocity in natural products on the lines of the treaty of 1866, but he also returned without being able to accomplish anything. In 1871 another effort was made by Sir John Macdonald, when the treaty of Washington was negotiated. An effort was then made to have that treaty extended to natural products, but the Americans again refused. In 1874 Sir Alexander Mackenzie sent a deputation to Washington, headed by the Hon. George Brown, to get reciprocity, but they also failed. In 1879, when the National Policy tariff resolutions and the Customs Act were passed, there was a statutory offer made for reciprocal tariff legislation, or reciprocity, in natural products, and that remained a standing offer to the United States for several years, but was never accepted. In 1891, for the last time, Sir John Macdonald appealed to the country and asked the people whether they were desirous of having reciprocity with the United States. If so, he said, we are prepared to make another effort as opposed to the policy of the Reform party in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union. On that issue both parties went to the country, and the Reform party was ignominiously defeated. Sir John was returned, and, true to his promise, he sent another deputation to Washington, but that met with a similar fate as its predecessors, and from that time to the present day the Conservatives have never made any effort to get a reciprocity treaty with the United States. From that day to the present they have never put any such plank in their platform, and I appeal to the Minister of Finance whether he was not absolutely incorrect when he said that from 1866 down to 1911 both parties were committed to such a policy. In 1891 the Reform party ran their election on unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union, and were defeated. In 1893 they put a plank in their platform in favour of reciprocity with the United States and appealed to the people. They carried the country, and in 1899 the right hon. the Prime Minister and Mr. John Charlton went to Washington to try and get reciprocity, but utterly failed, and the right hon. gentlemen then declared that they had made their last pilgrimage to Washington to secure a treaty, and would in future endeavour to develop this country on national lines. In view of these facts, is it right, therefore, to say that both parties were committed to that policy during all those years? I submit that from that time to the present neither party was committed to it.

My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has said, however, that if there was good reason for the demand in 1866 there is equally good reason for it in 1911. Well, I say there is not. Times and

conditions have both changed. To-day we have good markets, whereas then we had unprofitable markets. Since then the country has been developing in every line. Its people are amply employed at remunerative wages, its interprovincial trade has been growing and has grown immensely, and owing to this development and the increase in immigration we have a home market adequate for all our necessities. There could, therefore, be no comparison between 1866 and the present in that respect. We are to-day a full grown nation. We have reached that development which comes with maturity. We are now full grown, and can face the world in arms; we have the brain, brawn and muscle necessary to hold our own. We have good markets in Canada and ample employment for our own people. Can it, therefore, be said that we are in the same position as in 1866? I say no. Do we then require a reciprocity treaty to-day, as we did in 1866? Not at all. All we require to do is to continue working out our own national development, as we have been during the last 15 years. It seems to me that the epitaph on a certain tombstone would apply well to Canada if we should get this proposed treaty. The epitaph reads as follows:—

I was well, wished to be better;  
Took medicine and here I am.

Mr. FIELDING. Rather hard on the doctors.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, on political doctors just as well as on medical men. The Canadian people will say: We were well, our political doctors thought we should do better; they administered medicine, and now here we lie. What has been the ruin brought to Canada by the, I was going to say quack political physician and his empirical prescribing for the country's needs at this time!

I was much amused at the wonderful cheer that went up from the supporters of the Minister of Finance on the other side of the House, and from the colony on the back benches of this side when the Minister of Finance sat down. It was as though some oracle from Heaven had spoken—as though the clouds had opened and the shower came down from Heaven to revive the drooping spirits of the world. The hon. gentlemen acted as though they felt very much better. They reminded me of the sick Irishman, who was called upon by the doctor. Doctors have a habit, when they call upon a patient, of not only looking at the tongue and feeling the pulse, but of using a little instrument, such as I have here, a thermometer. First the thermometer must be shaken down to make sure that it is below 98 $\frac{3}{4}$ , the normal human temperature, and then it is placed under the