

Mr. NEILL: Then, sir, I would categorically name every member opposite until I do find out.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh no.

Mr. GEARY: My hon. friend made the remark himself. He said he could possibly waste the time of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what he said.

Mr. GEARY: The hon. member himself made the statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will proceed now.

Mr. NEILL: I said, sir, I supposed I could, but never for a moment would I think of doing so. I do suggest there must be something of a guilty conscience about the hon. gentleman who gets up and denies making the statement. Is there not a saying in French: *Qui s'excuse s'accuse*? Or, to render it into the vernacular: He is guilty who defends himself against no accusation.

Mr. IRVINE: Are you on the point of order now?

Mr. NEILL: The point of order is closed I understand. I have received the apology that one gentleman makes to another. I agree somewhat with one remark of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) when he said he saw no principle, in the real sense of the word, involved in a discussion of the tariff. Yesterday the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) dealt with that aspect of it. He referred repeatedly to principles connected with tariff matters, and he endeavoured to prove, possibly to his own satisfaction, that my hon. friends opposite in that corner of the house had, by their present or recent attitude, deviated in some way from tariff principles to which they had pledged adherence in years past. Then, we find my hon. friend from Nelson (Mr. Bird) saying this afternoon that a belief in tariff is not a principle, but a vice. So, you see, we have at least two points of view in the house. One is to the effect that belief in some particular form of tariff is a moral obligation not to be lightly disregarded, and not to be disregarded without incurring a moral obloquy; on the other hand we have the hon. member for Nelson boldly claiming his conviction that belief in any form of tariff is base, and to be deprecated as much as possible.

I agree to this extent with the hon. member for Nelson that I believe there is no principle involved in tariff matters. I would suggest that instead of invoking the word "principle" the tariff is to be regarded more as a matter of personal viewpoint or personal

policy, modified by three important factors. In the first place, it is modified by the man's occupation or business or the means by which he earns a livelihood, and by the opportunities which that occupation or business affords for personal aggrandisement by means of the introduction or operation of a tariff in some form. The second factor which, I would suggest, modifies the man's viewpoint is what might be called geographical location. One can imagine a farmer in British Columbia—and I know many of them—who are firm believers in tariff protection. If that same man lived on the prairies, as my hon. friends opposite do, and to some extent my hon. friends behind me, he would probably change his views. He would not change by any weakening of moral principle or obligation, or disregard of his duty to his God, his country or his fellow man, but merely by the pressure of economic conditions. He might in time become a free trader—like my friends opposite, if they will not be offended when I use that term. In view of their action in connection with this resolution, perhaps one should be a little careful.

The third factor which influences the point of view of a man in formulating his tariff belief is the exigencies of party politics. A man will adhere to tariff policies in connection with a political party; he will swallow policies that he does not believe in and which he does not like, sometimes with results prejudicial to himself, because they are policies adopted in the long forgotten past by the political party to which he owes allegiance. He will adhere to them, no matter what his personal convictions may be. It is for those reasons, sir, that we have found in the past and will no doubt find in the future that the Liberal party when in opposition professes a wide and extreme adherence to the policies of free trade. They pledge themselves to a great extent to carry out those policies should they come into office. Then when they do assume power they do not carry out the pledges they have made to the extent one would expect, judging from their utterances while in opposition.

In the same way we find the great Conservative party, when in opposition, continually harping on tariff, tariff, and more tariff, and holding it out as the one thing under heaven and above hell to cure every ill that the body politic could be heir to. When they assume power, however, what do we find? As in the case of the Liberals, they do not live up to the extremes of tariff policies they have been advocating, and I do not blame them in the least. Neither do I blame the Liberals, because the reason that applies is the same in both cases, and it is a twofold