

Mr. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): What Canada needs is more courage in relation to the tariff.

Mr. WARD: Are you opposed to the tariff policy?

Mr. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): I certainly am not. I have heard you bark from different corners of the house under that old and dusty banner of free trade. I say to my hon. friends, if there is a man in this house who is prepared to stand up now and say that he advocates free trade I will pause and wait until he identifies himself. But there is not an hon. member who does not know that the most antiquated thing politically in this country is free trade. Who is there in Canada who will say that he is a free trader? Will any member of the government rise and declare for free trade? Will the Minister of Trade and Commerce rise in his place and say that he stands for free trade?

Mr. EULER: No.

Mr. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): Will the Minister of Justice rise and say he stands for free trade? No; he says no.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Oh, no; he said nothing.

Mr. POWER: If you will stand up and say you are for high protection I will stand up and say I am for free trade.

Mr. GRAY: He fought a platform on it—what happened?

Mr. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): Even the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) would not rise and make such a declaration. He knows he would not rise again in Parry Sound if he did. Will the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) rise and say he is for free trade? Why, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that free trade is the greatest piece of political camouflage in Canada to-day. There is not an honourable free trader within sound of my voice to-night—not one. They are afraid to rise, because they know that by export restrictions, by all sorts of quotas, by the militant attitude of various countries that have their backs to the wall to-day, there can be no such thing, either in logic or in sound common sense, as free trade. My hon. friends are therefore, veering round to the old Conservative policy, trying to steal the idea that they have so long condemned.

May I say in conclusion that the farmers of this country—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member's time has expired.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the unanimous consent of the house.

Mr. GRAY: Did the hon. member go before the national convention of the National Liberal-Conservative party—

An hon. MEMBER: You have the wrong name.

Mr. GRAY: Did the hon. member try to get the convention?

Mr. MANION: No, he did not; he was helping me.

Mr. POULIOT: It is surprising the hon. gentleman was elected.

Mr. SLAGHT: Will the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) permit a question with reference to his observation that his party will be successful in the next election. For the benefit of hon. members on this side of the house will he indicate whether, in the policy which I understand his hon. leader has been persuaded to adopt, he had a green light out for truth or a red light out for romance.

Mr. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to finish what I was about to say?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): I should like to reply to the hon. member for Parry Sound. He is a genial gentleman for whom I have a great regard. But when he talks about the green light out for integrity and the yellow light out for romance, I would ask him to let his mind go back to the last provincial election in Ontario, and he will find that he had little romance and less integrity. He told the people of Ontario that if they voted for Earl Rowe their stocks would drop 15 per cent—

Mr. GRAY: They did.

Mr. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): Yes, but they did not vote for me; they voted for his friend; he was elected, and their stocks dropped 30 per cent. So when he talks about the green light of integrity he can get no comfort out of that, but he might find some out of the yellow light of romance.

In conclusion, I wish to urge this house to consider carefully, and I want to urge on the Minister of Agriculture, independent of politics—

Mr. TUCKER: Is the hon. member against the bill?