

opinion in favour of reciprocity. If the sentiment were allowed to lapse, possibly the American people would be justified in assuming that we did not want reciprocity. Consequently, I repeat that it is my belief that this exchange of opinion to-day on the floor of this House will be noticed by the American people, so that they will see that we have not forgotten what we believe to be beneficial to this country in the way of the reciprocity agreement, and that there is a large number of people in Canada, indeed, I believe, the majority of the people, who will avail themselves of the benefits of the reciprocity offer as soon as they are permitted to do so, and I think that will be in the very near future.

As I have sat in my seat and listened to speeches delivered by hon. members, it has been rather amusing to me to hear one hon. member say that the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) has thrown his hat in the ring as a protectionist and then to hear, I believe it was the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), state that the tariff was lower now than it ever was under the reciprocity agreement, thereby endeavouring to claim credit for the fact that there are benefits accruing from a reduced tariff, and trying to take all the compliments that it is possible to take by the statement that the tariff is lower now. That was an indirect admission that benefits do accrue from a decreased tariff. But I am and have been in favour of reciprocity, as I was in 1911 when I met the right hon. gentleman who was then leader of the Opposition (Sir Robert Borden) in the city of Weyburn, I being one of the three who waited on him at that time and asked that his party pledge themselves to support reciprocity if they were elected to power. I regret that he refused to accept our request; he did not give us a pledge; but I wish to point out to the House that the province from which I have the honour to come supported the theory that the committee advanced to him in the city of Weyburn at that time. That was in the year 1911.

If I have a proper remembrance of what my old Collier's history taught me, tariffs have been the cause of many grievous wars. I go back to the year 1837, when what is known as the Opium War was on in China. That was a lesson to Great Britain. English capital was interested in the opium trade, and endeavoured to make the Chinese pay tribute to them in that trade. I believe it is generally admitted that Great Britain learned a great lesson in that war.

Another case was the war of Independence in the United States. We all remember how the Boston tea merchants were opposed to the imposition of the duty, and how they boarded the ships and dumped all the tea into the harbour. I mention these only as illustrations of the fact that tariffs and high duties are the cause of discontent and mistrust among the people; yet this Government and the Government elected in 1911 have maintained high protective tariffs—too high in many instances, we believe. Certain tariffs may be justified, but the fact remains that tariffs have been the cause of more world upheavals and more discontent than any other single factor. I am persuaded, and have been for a long time, that a reduction in tariffs will make for more harmonious trade meetings among our people. An illustration of that was given here this afternoon; when an individual trades with his wealthy neighbour he is not going to do him personal or bodily injury.

As to the United States buying products from this country, instances have already been cited, which I need not repeat to the House to-night. I would draw attention to this fact, however. The people of the United States require the hard wheat from our western plains more to-day than they did in 1911, to mix with their softer wheats. In 1911 the States of Minnesota and North and South Dakota were largely engaged in the growing of hard wheats. But to-day that is not so. They are growing the Durum wheats, and they are more anxious than ever to-day to secure the hard wheat from our Prairie Provinces to mix with their wheat to make flour that they can sell in the Old Country in competition with ours. As time goes on, they will require more and more of our hard wheats, to retain their market in the Old Country for their flour. That is another and a sufficient reason, and a growing reason, why reciprocity with the United States should be adopted.

I maintain that the Government should not, and cannot, take credit to themselves because they have accepted some of the provisions of the reciprocity agreement. They now actually admit that some of the provisions of the reciprocity agreement have proved beneficial to the people, but I maintain that they cannot claim any credit, because in 1911 all their arguments were directed to proving that reciprocity would be injurious to the people of this country. I can see no consistency in their attitude.