

protected one, and also on account of ten or twelve times the amount of capital invested in the fruit industry in the United States as compared with Canada, and the larger investment always tends and strives to crush the smaller.

And whereas, the value of fruit and vegetable lands would be materially diminished.

And whereas the fruit and vegetable growers have from time to time in the past emphasized to the government of the day the desirability of a moderately protective tariff; therefore, be it resolved that:

The Canadian government be respectfully requested to maintain the present Canadian tariff on fruits and vegetables entering Canada, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. David Henderson, M.P., for Halton.

Moved by A. W. Peart, seconded by Robert Fowler.

H. T. FOSTER,

Pres. Burlington Fruit Growers' Association.

W. E. A. PEER,

Sec. Burlington Fruit Growers' Association.

I present this petition Mr. Speaker, hoping that it will assist the right hon. gentleman to find a reasonable excuse for withdrawing from the compact which he has announced to the House.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I do not know that these extracts are all in perfect order, but as we have been having some of them, and as I have here a newspaper that has been sent to me without any communication, asking me to read it to the House, perhaps it would be as well if I should do so. The article is from the Summerland 'Review,' which I suppose is the organ of the fruit industry in British Columbia. There is an article from Mr. Burrell, with reference to the question, and this article in the 'Review,' is headed 'Sober Second Thoughts.'

Mr. BURRELL. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that this extraordinary article is from my pen?

Mr. PATERSON. No. It may, perhaps, come from the hon. gentleman's pen after he has the sober second thought which the editor recommends. The editorial in this fruit organ is as follows:

#### SOBER SECOND THOUGHTS.

When the people of Canada have overcome the scare many have apparently been driven into in connection with the reciprocity agreement between the United States and Canada, we believe that the general opinion will be that the agreement is one of the greatest achievements of statesmanship to be recorded in the Laurier regime, in fact, something too good to come to pass, for the American Senate will hardly pass it. This may sound strange coming from a newspaper essentially Conservative in its politics, particularly in view of the fact that many of our politicians see in the agreement much out of which to make political capital.

Mr. HENDERSON.

In matters so great as this, where the interests of the whole Dominion are at stake, and Canada is getting that for which the Dominion has worked hard since 1865, we believe the matter of politics should be laid aside and the question studied soberly so as to be fully understood.

Going back to 1854, a treaty of reciprocity in natural products was entered into between the United States and Canada. This was the result, largely, of the personal work and influence of Lord Elgin, then Governor General of Canada. This treaty proved of great value to both countries and under it Canada revived in a marked degree. That treaty covered the navigation of the St. Lawrence, the fisheries question, and provided for mutual free trade between Canada and the United States in the products of the two countries. For six years the Elgin treaty worked particularly advantageously to Canada. Then the strained relations between England and the United States over the Alabama claims, brought on the question on the part of the United States of the abrogation of that treaty. For five years more it was continued, then in 1865 the American Senate cancelled the agreement.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do not think it is quite proper for a minister of the Crown to obstruct his own motion for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means by reading a long article in defence of the government's policy, and thereby setting a bad example to the House. I want to ask your ruling on the question whether this conduct is strictly in accordance with parliamentary usage.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Minister of Customs has seconded the motion before the Chair, and I presume that he has a right to speak.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not object to the point of order. I am glad that it has been taken. It just emphasizes the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite cannot hear the truth and remain quiet under it—that they are afraid of free discussion—afraid of anything being said which will conflict with their pet theory.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The motion is for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means. I ask whether the hon. gentleman can discuss the matter contained in the motion, as he is doing, by reading an extract.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have been consulting Bourinot in the last day or two on that point, and I find that it would be irregular to discuss the resolution now before the committee. But the doctrine laid down by Bourinot is that on a motion for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, or into Committee of Supply, almost any question which is not on the Order Paper, or in committee, may be discussed; but a specific reference to the resolution before