

trade between Canada and the United States. There are some twenty or thirty other countries that will be affected and will have the same right to send their products into Canada as will the United States, while at the same time retaining their duties against Canadian products going into their country. The thing is so manifestly unfair and unreasonable that I cannot, for the life of me, see how any person who is interested in farming can give it his support.

The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's did not always hold his present view. He is on record time and time again in this House, and likewise his former leader the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as against anything of this kind. I can quote statements from the speeches of the hon. gentleman, when he was Finance Minister of this country, in which he spoke year after year in favour of tariff stability, and said that any changes made in the duties on what the farmer produced and had to sell were made along the lines of increasing rather than decreasing the tariff. I could quote the tariff figures to show that that was true. My hon. friends opposite did follow that course, but in 1911—after the present leader of the Opposition had published his report and made his appeal to his colleagues at that time—they made the fatal mistake of acceding to his request and adopting his suggestion that the tariff should be removed from all natural products. Another thing I want to say in that connection is that in my judgment a fatal error in the proposition is that it absolutely loses sight of the climatic difference between this and other countries, and that it seems to lose sight also of the fact that transportation facilities have been so enormously improved that the country which, thirty or twenty-five years ago, was on the other side of the world from us is to-day our next door neighbour. These are things which apparently these hon. gentlemen have forgotten.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very sorry to have to inform the hon. member for Frontenac that if he proceeds in addressing the House he will interfere, and interfere very seriously, with the large number of conversations which are going on on the floor of the House and, I am sorry to say, in the galleries.

Mr. FIELDING: It is very unfair on his part.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Everybody shut up.

Mr. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I can hold my own in making a noise when I happen to have the floor. While I will not undertake to make as much noise as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) did, still I will try and second him as closely as I can. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's said in this House last session:

I do not think myself as things are going now that we can look to that party—

That is the party to my right:

—for a sound tariff policy.

The hon. gentleman also candidly stated:

I do not even think we can expect to get a sound and safe tariff policy by a too rigid adherence to every line and every letter of the Liberal tariff platform.

Well, I am not going to quarrel with either of these statements; I think they are absolutely correct. I do not think that the House or the country can rely upon either of these parties at all as to a tariff policy. I have held that opinion for quite a while, and I am confirmed in it by the attitude of hon. gentlemen this afternoon in bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Before I take my seat I want to say this much further: There has never been a Government in Canada, from Confederation down to the present time, which has done as much in a practical way for the farmers of this country as the present Government has done.

Mr. CASGRAIN: In what respect?

Mr. EDWARDS: I will not attempt—because I do not want to occupy too much time and it would take a long time—to fill the void in my hon. friend's cranium. I am not going to attempt to impart knowledge to him on all these matters. He is a young man yet and I would advise him to give a little diligent study to these questions. Then he will not act so much like a school boy in this House.

I have strong reasons for making the statement I did. In the first place grants to agriculture are four times what they were in the years preceding the war. I could refer to many other things in substantiation of my statement that this Government have never lost sight of the interest of the farmers. Sir, any Government which would accept an amendment of that kind would be wanting in its duty. That amendment is very much worse than the policy adopted in 1911 because it raises the duties on many articles to a much