

them—as long as such candidate will support him, it does not matter what his principles or policy are, all those things count for nothing; the only thing that counts is whether the candidate will vote for the hon. member for Prince, the leader of the Opposition. Here is the candidate supported in West Peterborough, and this is the platform that he ran on, supported by the leader who declared throughout his whole speaking campaign in Western Canada that his policy was practically identical with that of the farmer's party—practically identical—that they were both great Liberal movements, both in full accord with these historic principles of Liberalism. I will read some of the “historic principles of Liberalism:”

I am not and never have been a free trader and do not support free trade.

“But,” says my hon. friend, “may be he just wants a tariff for revenue.” That is the camouflage that is often thrown over it. Well, see how he expresses it, if all he wants is a tariff for revenue. He declares that “I will stand by Canada's industry and Canada's labour until the last,” in contradistinction to being a free trader. That is one of the “historic principles of Liberalism,” fought for in the county of Peterborough, and supported by the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) and by the leader of the Opposition. Then he goes on:

You know my record for the last fifteen years, and my policy has been, Peterborough First.

That is not all; perhaps there is something more direct than that. All this is from his own published advertisement, signed by the Liberal committee of the county of Peterborough, and consequently must be in full harmony with the “principles of Liberalism.” Here are a few more specimens of Liberalism:

I believe in the protection of industries—

That is pretty straight.

—and the protection of labour. I believe in a greater and more prosperous Peterborough. Can anyone dispute that belief when it is expressed by a man whose very existence depends on the progress of industry and its consequent results? Mr. Gordon will be one of the first to suffer from the effects of industrial depression brought about by a lower tariff.

I know that is not all, and am sure my hon. friends opposite will have no difficulty at all in seeing how striking is the “issue that divides the electorate of Canada” on

this tariff matter. Here is another specimen:

I stand for the protection of industry, and by that I mean the protection of labour. The standard of living and character of the working home are grand tests of civilization.

Such are the “historic principles of Liberalism” fought for in that county. I ask attention to those matters on the part of my hon. friend from Red Deer and all those who sit around him, whose affections are sought to be entwined by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and who know right well that they exist in his mind as public men for one purpose, and one only—to catch the low tariff vote in certain parts of Canada while he catches the high tariff vote in other parts of Canada, and by the numerical addition of the two tries to exalt himself to power.

This candidate in the Peterborough election declared that I was guilty of conduct unworthy a public man, that the tariff was not an issue, that he stood for protection, and that I would deserve all I might get for being so “shameless” as to obtrude the tariff issue there at all.

Now, I ask this House: Are we to be invited by the leader of the Opposition to dissolve Parliament and go to the country on this issue—because he told us last session it was the great issue, and I do not know what has arisen since—when no human being in this Dominion knows where the leader of the other party is on the issue, and when he is determined that no human being shall ever know? In the Speech from the Throne which we are discussing now there is a paragraph that defines clearly and definitely where the Government stands, a paragraph that states the principle in words that no man can fail to comprehend, a paragraph that in so stating our policy places it exactly where it stands in the published platform of the party. I should like to know how we are to get that issue to the people until my hon. friend does the same. And he has a chance now. May I ask you Mr. Speaker: Has he accepted the chance? Is there a single hon. gentleman in this House, on that side or on this or anywhere else—particularly among those whom I am addressing now, behind the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark)—is there one single hon. gentleman here who does not believe that the Leader of the Opposition, instead of accepting the issue laid down in the Speech from the Throne, will now commence a process of evasion and