

party have proclaimed themselves in favour of increased protection to the industries of this country, and they have supported the position of my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and have said that the government should have adopted the policy which had been advocated by that hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) before he left the present administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what really are we to make of the attitude of the Liberal party in that regard? I leave it to you, Sir, if, after carefully digesting, as I know you have done, the speech of the Minister of Finance yesterday, you are one whit the wiser as to what the policy of the Liberal party is with regard to protection and free trade. I know, Sir, that by the usages and custom of the House you are debarred from making any answer to my question, and, of course, I put the question only in a formal way, but I am quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that if you were at liberty to answer you would be just as dumb as you are at present.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Now, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative party believes in a policy of adequate protection; a policy of such adequate protection as will maintain and strengthen Canadian industries; such a policy as will give our own market to our own people. That policy we have declared in all parts of the country. We believe that such a policy is in the interests of all parts of Canada and of all classes of the community. I think that word 'adequate' attracted the attention of my hon. friend Mr. Haldimand, and I will give him my good authority for the use of that word by and by. In the western states the policy of protection has found favour with the farmers, because they see built up in all that western country great industrial centres; because they feel the advantage of a protected home market, and because they know that without the protection of that home market they would get very much less for their products than they do at present. As I said before, I believe that the farmers in the western part of Canada will have the same experience, and that they will learn, even more than they do at present—and they do very largely realize it at present—the advantages of our home market; the advantages

to this country of the protection of the home market so far as all classes of the people are concerned.

It is sometimes said that the farmers cannot be protected. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce took that ground last year. He said the only way in which you could protect them would be by giving them a bounty. I want to point out to my hon. friend that there are people in this country whose claims have been denied by this government—I refer to the lead miners of British Columbia—who look on this matter in a somewhat different aspect. During my visit to the western part of this country I found that they complained bitterly that the tariff fails to give them any protection whatever, while the farmer has a very considerable protection. After enumerating a number of implements upon which a duty must be paid by the miner, they proceed as follows:

Wheat protected by a duty of 12 cents per bushel; oats protected by a duty of 10 cents per bushel; hay protected by a duty of \$2 per ton; potatoes protected by a duty of 15 cents per bushel; eggs protected by a duty of 3 cents per dozen; poultry protected by a duty of 20 per cent; cattle and sheep protected by a duty of 20 per cent; hogs protected by a duty of 25 per cent; fruits protected by a duty of 25 per cent; condensed milk, canned at Truro, Nova Scotia, protected by a duty of 3½ cents a pound; peas, corn, beans, canned, protected by a duty of 2½ cents per pound; apples, pears, peaches, canned, protected by a duty that averages over 100 per cent; preserved meats protected by a duty of 25 per cent; ham and bacon protected by a duty of 2 cents per pound; cheese protected by a duty of 3 cents per pound; butter protected by a duty of 4 cents per pound; and so on.

It will be observed that the lead miner of the west entertains an entirely different view from that expressed last year by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as to the possibility of protecting the farmer. I am not suggesting that the protection to the farmer is too high; I think it is not high enough. I believe that upon many agricultural products the duty ought to be increased, so that a country like Canada, possessing agricultural capabilities second to none in the world, should not be handicapped in competition with the United States and should not be obliged to import from