

they can do without, and they are not likely to take any more in the future out of generosity than they have done in the past. They only take what suits them. From the United States returns I find that they sent into Canada last year \$213,554 worth of potatoes, whereas they took from us only \$36,000 worth. Where would the poor Nova Scotians be if the duty were taken off potatoes and the Americans had the freedom of our market? I am inclined to think they would be worse off rather than better. Then, the Canadian farmer has eggs to sell, and where is he going to sell them? The ninety-five million of people of the United States took from us last year only \$12,500 worth of eggs, whereas we took from them \$117,517 worth. What a wonderful benefit it will be to the Canadian farmers and farmers' wives who have eggs to sell, when they find that they will have to compete in their home market with the importation of double or treble the quantity of American eggs when the duty is taken off. The same is true with regard to horses and the same with regard to cheese.

The Minister of Finance stated, as a justification for making this treaty, that both political parties in Canada were committed to such a proposal ever since 1866, when the old reciprocity treaty was abolished. Well, in my judgment he was a little out in his history and was not quite accurate in his facts. Canada, he said, enjoyed good times during the continuance of that treaty from 1854 to 1866, and presumably those good times were due to that treaty. I want to ask those who know anything about the history of that time, is that a fact? I say emphatically that it is not. What gave us the good times that we enjoyed from 1854 to 1856 or 1857? It was the Russian war, which ran up the price of everything we had to sell. We sold wheat in the barn for \$2 a bushel, and everything else at correspondingly high prices. After that, for some years, notwithstanding the reciprocity treaty, we had rather bad times. Prices went down lower and lower until 1861, when the American war started, and we had good times again. Why had we those good times? The Minister of Finance says because of the treaty of 1866. Not at all. It was because 5,000,000 people in the United States were withdrawn from peaceful pursuits of agriculture, to fight for their rights, and that country had to depend on other countries for its supplies, and everything went up enormously in price. I happened to be living in the United States in 1866, and I remember the high prices we had to pay for everything—25 cents per pound for pork, from 20 to 24 cents per pound for beef, and correspondingly high prices for butter, cheese and all other articles of

Mr. SPROULE.

food. An ordinary suit of clothes cost \$125. Our horses and cattle went to the United States in thousands and were sold at very high figures. We had good times, not because of the reciprocity treaty, but because so many of their people were taken from the peaceful pursuits of agriculture and the country had to get its requirements from other countries, and Canada, being so close to the United States, enjoyed the advantage of that condition of things. In 1865 the war closed. I was in the United States in 1866 and 1867, when they abolished the reciprocity treaty, and what was one of the reasons they gave for doing it? I remember one of the generals speaking in Detroit at the time, and saying: Over five millions of our people were taken from the peaceful pursuits of life for many years, and we stopped production, and were obliged to get our supplies from other countries; but the war is now over, these people have gone back to their regular pursuits, and they will be able to supply us with all the foodstuffs we require, and we are bound as a nation, in the interests of our own people, to abolish this treaty and to put up the duties on these articles, so that we can keep the market of our own country for our own people. And the Americans abolished the treaty for that purpose, and put very high duties on everything that went into that country. I remember that the duty on a box of matches was 10 cents, and everything else was in proportion; and from that time on we were shut out of the United States market. Then the Finance Minister said, and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) as well, that both parties in Canada have been committed to such a proposal since 1866 up to the present. That history, I submit, is not correct, and I propose to show that it is not. Since 1897 the Conservative party have never submitted to the people a policy of reciprocity. It is also incorrect as regards the Reform party. In 1891 that party went before the electorate with the policy of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union and not limited reciprocity, and they ran their election on that platform and were sadly defeated.

What has been the history of both political parties in this country with regard to their efforts to secure reciprocity from 1866 to the present? In 1866, after the abolition of the treaty, Sir Alexander Galt and Sir William Howland went to Washington to secure reciprocity, but failed. In 1868, after confederation, there was a clause inserted in our first tariff Act declaring our readiness to enter into a similar limited treaty with the United States if they were prepared to reciprocate. That clause, however, remained ineffective. In 1869 Sir John Rose was despatched to Washington by the government of Sir John