

the new premier of the day found himself in office with a very slim majority. He had been elected on a popular policy but the party which he opposed was strongly entrenched. Being in power he proceeded to carry out the policy on which he had been elected. The opposition were fully aware that it was dangerous and fatal for them to go to the country, but at the same time they proceeded to aggravate, and annoy, the new ministry, and to obstruct to the fullest measure of their ability. They would bring in amendments and the government would not know if they were going to be defeated or not. The opposition endeavoured in every way not only to embarrass the government in carrying out its policy, but at the same time by insidious propaganda to represent that the more or less vacillating conduct of the government was due not to their obstruction but to its inherent weakness. The premier was supposed to be a man lacking in political experience and they thought they could play that game with him. He went along with the policy he had outlined but one fine night the opposition found to their intense surprise that they had defeated the government. In six weeks, however, the administration was back in power again with a sufficient majority. The premier had arranged the thing with a couple of his followers, and, in slang parlance showed the opposition "where they were at," and it has been a lesson to me ever since.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NEILL: Had hon. gentlemen opposite allowed me to finish my remarks they would have heard me say it was a lesson to me not merely politically but in all phases of life, for I have ever found that a bold progressive policy always gets a man farther than one of hesitating for fear he gets his feet wet. I believe—and I believe it is as true here to-day as it was in Australia at that time—that this country wants a policy of moderate protection, a policy of protection to the young and struggling industries in all parts of the country, particularly of the West, also a tariff policy that will ease up and reduce the heavy protection now existing on the older and better established industries. I believe that if the government appealed to the country on such a policy they would get an ample and sufficient mandate to carry it out.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Shaw), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Anderson,	Knox,
Arthurs,	Ladner,
Baneroft,	Leader,
Baxter,	Lovie,
Black (Huron),	Lucas,
Black (Yukon),	Macphail,
Bowen,	McKillop,
Boys,	McTaggart,
Brethen,	Manion,
Brown,	Maybee,
Caldwell,	Meighen,
Campbell,	Morrison,
Charters,	Preston,
Church,	Reed,
Clark,	Ross (Simcoe),
Cooze,	Ryckman,
Davies,	Senn,
Dickie,	Shaw,
Drayton (Sir Henry),	Sheard,
Evans,	Simpson,
Findlay,	Spence,
Forke,	Spencer,
Gardiner,	Stansell,
Garland (Bow River),	Steedsman,
Good,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Gould,	Stewart (Humboldt),
Grimmer,	Stewart (Leeds),
Guthrie,	Sutherland,
Hanson,	Thompson,
Harris,	Thurston,
Hodgins,	Tolmie,
Hoey,	Wallace,
Jelliff,	Ward,
Johnston (Last Mountain),	Warner,
Jones,	White,
Kennedy (Edmonton),	Wilson,
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),	Woods,
King (Huron),	Woodsworth—76.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Euler,
Baldwin,	Fielding,
Beaubien,	Finn,
Béland,	Fontaine,
Bénoit,	Forrester,
Binette,	Fortier,
Boivin,	Fournier,
Bouchard,	Gauvreau,
Boucher,	Gendron,
Bourassa,	Gervais,
Bureau,	Gordon,
Cahill,	Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Cannon,	Graham,
Cardin,	Hammell,
Carmichael,	Hatfield,
Carroll,	Hughes,
Carruthers,	Humphrey,
Chevrier,	Hunt,
Clifford,	Irvine,
Copp,	Jacobs,
d'Anjou,	Kay,
Déchêne,	Kellner,
Delisle,	King (Kootenay),
Denis (Joliette),	King, Mackenzie (York),
Denis (St. Denis),	Kyte,
Desaulniers,	Lafamme,
Deslauriers,	Lanctôt,
Desrocher,	Lapierre,
Duff,	Lapointe,
Elliott (Dundas),	Lavigueur,
Éthier,	Léger,