

things for which the hon. member for Brandon condemned them in 1925. They are asking this house to give protection to industries on a higher basis than before, which the hon. member formerly condemned. I am glad to know that he is seeing some semblance of light and is coming to realize the plight in which he has been placed by forgetting the principles which he espoused in 1925. He must never forget the words:

While the lamp holds out to burn,

The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) is going to supply the second line:

The vilest sinner may return.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go a step further. I heard this going on from one end of western Canada to the other. It is now over thirty years since I went to western Canada, and I need offer no apology now, in the words of Macaulay, for having maintained consistently the faith which I then had with respect to this country and the fiscal policy which should be followed to bring success and prosperity. I heard these statements, and I was about to refer to the remarks made by one of the Liberal senators in which, in order to arouse public prejudice and the passions of the people, he stated that these Tory manufacturers, rich at the expense of the people, had sent their families south to Bar Harbour and the summering places nearby, then to Newport among the new rich of the United States. Then he said, "Grown greater still, wrapped around with the mantle of wealth taken by exploitation from the taxpayers of the country, they sent their wives and daughters over to the great watering places of Europe, to marry their children to the effete and worn out aristocracy of Europe?" Those are the arguments which were made; I am sure my hon. friend has heard them, but I am happy to say that he has never used them. This campaign was carried far and wide, and people believed it. The hon. member for Brandon believed it; the hon. members before me believed it and the men and women to my left believed that the Liberal party of that day were honest in what they said, as the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) pointed out the other night, and that they would do what they promised. When they did not do it Liberal partisans, to make their position secure, went around and denounced this party as the party of high and ever higher protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: Hon. members say, "hear, hear". I defy them now to point to

anything which the Conservative party have endeavoured to place on the statute books of this country during the last fifteen years to justify the position they have taken. I will go further. I recall that when the reciprocity agreement was introduced it contained provision for a duty on Portland cement, and I wonder if the hon. Minister of National Defence, realized when he spoke about the reciprocity agreement the other day that the alteration of a single item terminated the entire agreement; not one single item could be changed without terminating the entire agreement. It was not a treaty; there was no written agreement or treaty. It could be destroyed at the caprice of either party. Canadian cement was protected by a high duty, but one of the first things Sir Thomas White did as Minister of Finance was to reduce the duty on cement. That is the answer to my hon. friend.

I might perhaps digress a moment here to ask the Minister of National Defence and the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley), who spoke on the reciprocity agreement, if they realize that that was not an agreement at all; that each country passed a statute and placed it on its own statute books, so that either party, by changing a single item, would terminate the whole arrangement. In 1920 we had in this country all the benefits of the reciprocity agreement; we had free admission of cattle, potatoes, wheat and other grains into the markets of the United States. Then what happened? There was a change in the government of the United States, and the farmers voted for a high protective tariff against Canada; they had no thought of what would happen to Canadians. I saw Canadian cattlemen ruined by that tariff, which was put into effect without a single thought as to what would happen to the farmers and cattlemen of this country. In the United States they did not care what happened to the Canadians, they were legislating for the people of their own country. Our cattle and our wheat were shut out of the United States market. Do hon. gentlemen not recall the circumstances under which the tariff on wheat was increased up to 42 cents per bushel? I saw that change take place. I saw them raise the duty from 25 to 42 cents. I saw our cattle shut out. Now many of them would like to have our cattle, but the farmers of the United States have a great voting power, and they want the tariff maintained against Canadian cattle and Canadian wheat and they are as much farmers as my hon. friends yonder. Now, sir, digressing for a moment with respect to that, I say to the Minister